NEW SOLUTIONS OF
NEW TESTAMENT
PROBLEMS · *Goodspeed*

28-1184

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

FB14
G62n

1/38

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/newsolutionsofne0000unse_j1j6

NEW SOLUTIONS OF NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., NEW YORK; THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED, TORONTO; THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON; THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI; THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI.

NEW SOLUTIONS *of* NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek
Chairman of the Department of New Testament and
Early Christian Literature

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
PRESS · CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT 1927 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED DECEMBER, 1927

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

225.12
G655n

TO MY FATHER
THOMAS WAKEFIELD GOODSPEED
ON HIS EIGHTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY

N10943

PREFACE

WITH all our study of the New Testament, the relations of its books to one another have been neglected. Not, of course, altogether; yet so generally that some of the main facts of these interrelationships have never been brought out. And yet these facts are of great importance.

The letters of Paul had individually no effect upon other Christian writings. It was only after they were gathered into a collection and, as we should say, published that their literary influence began. The distinction between the letters scattered among the churches to which Paul wrote them and the same letters gathered into a collection and published, must be sharply drawn. Only as a collection did they begin to influence Christian literature. This consideration gives that event serious importance; how did it come about?

Probably as a result of the publication of the Acts, with its striking picture of Paul. Certain it is that up to the publication of the Acts no work of Christian literature shows acquaintance with Paul's letters; whereas after the appearance of the Acts practically every Christian document does so. The facts involved in this observation are not new, but only the interpretation of them that is here suggested.

Ephesians, as we now know its text, is an encyclical; it is clearly influenced by the assembled letters of Paul,

although it is not his. These are the established facts; what is the meaning of them? Evidently that Ephesians was written by the makers of the first Pauline collection, as an introduction to it, to make these letters, originally written to various local churches, into one great encyclical to all the churches. Certainly the publication of the collection had just that effect.

The Revelation begins with what looks like a collection of letters to seven churches, but is really one letter containing messages to all seven. The reflection of the newly formed Pauline *corpus* in this can hardly be mistaken. But this at once supplies a date for the formation of the collection, and for the incidental writing of Ephesians, and explains the perplexing literary character of the Revelation, half letter collection and half apocalypse.

After the publication of Paul's collected letters, in fact, Christian instruction finds expression in a shower of church letters and encyclicals, all more or less influenced and even shaped by the collected Pauline letters. It follows that they can be properly understood only as written in the presence of such a collection.

Not only single letters of religious instruction, but a whole series of collections of them give conclusive proof of the powerful and sustained influence of the Pauline *corpus* upon Christian literary expression. Even the formation of the great collection of gospels cannot be understood apart from it.

Christian literature may thus be said to have developed not so much by individual documents as by collec-

tions. To present this position, and to offer some substantiation for it, is the purpose of these pages. They present few facts not already established and familiar. The meaning of these facts, however, has not always been perceived even by those best acquainted with them. The interpretation of them here presented is offered in the hope not only of throwing light on such problems as the origin of the Pauline *corpus,* the presence in it of Philemon, the composition of Ephesians, and the hybrid character of the Revelation, but also of making possible a new approach to the later literature of the New Testament.

The collection of Paul's letters—as distinguished from the writing of them—is an event that calls for explanation. Paul did not collect them; why was it ever done? But once made, the Pauline *corpus* sprang at once into a position of extraordinary influence, and for half a century largely shaped Christian literary expression. Ephesians was written to introduce it; the Revelation owes its hybrid literary character to its overshadowing presence; and a host of letters and a whole series of letter collections sprang up under its influence, and even in imitation of it. Such was the dazzling impression made by the collection upon its contemporaries. They simply could not escape its influence. Its spell was upon them, and without the realization of this they cannot be understood.

The importance of the Acts in this connection makes it natural to include in this volume certain earlier papers dealing with it. I have also added two articles embody-

ing definite suggestions as to the ending of Mark and the effect of Hebrews which further illustrate the interrelations of early Christian writings. I must acknowledge the kindness of the editors of the *Expositor* and of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in permitting me to reprint, with some revision, the last five of the papers that follow.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

June 30, 1927

CONTENTS

I. The Acts the Cause of the Collection of Paul's Letters 1

II. Ephesians the Introduction to the Pauline Collection 11

III. The Pauline Collection Reflected in the Revelation 21

IV. The Pauline Collection the Background of the Later Christian Letters 29

V. The Contents of the First Pauline Collection . 50

VI. The Origin of Acts 65

VII. The Date of Acts 94

VIII. The Vocabulary of Luke and Acts 104

IX. I Clement Called Forth by Hebrews 110

X. The Original Conclusion of Mark 116

Index 123

I

THE ACTS THE CAUSE OF THE COLLECTION OF PAUL'S LETTERS

THE Acts of the Apostles forms the prelude to a new phase of New Testament literature. The earliest phase is obviously the letters of Paul, written in the course of the development and spread of Christianity among the Greeks—the Greek mission. The second is that of the earliest gospels, Mark, Matthew, and the two-volume work known to us as Luke and Acts. But the letters of Paul do not form the background of this second phase. There is an increasing agreement among scholars that the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts show no direct influence of the letters of Paul. Pauline influence they show in plenty, but that influence was not exerted through his letters. It was the effect of his life and his personal teaching. The broad characteristic of the early gospel writings is non-acquaintance with Paul's letters. This is especially clear in the Acts, which, with all its interest in Paul, never reflects his letters. In fact the writer of Acts cannot have been acquainted with his letters, or he would have used them with great effect to strengthen and enrich his story of the work of Paul. Other letters he professes to know of (chaps. 15 and 23) but not Paul's. Historical scholarship is reasonably

united upon the conclusion that no collection of Paul's letters was known to the writer of Acts.

But after Acts, all is changed. Every book shows the influence of the letters of Paul. Beginning with the Revelation of John—which, although it is an apocalypse, actually opens with a little *corpus* of letters of its own—and continuing with Hebrews, I Clement, I Peter, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas, the existence and influence of the principal Pauline letters is strikingly apparent. In fact they actually constitute the background of all subsequent New Testament literature.

This can mean only one thing. When Acts was written, Paul's letters had not been collected and published. But they were gathered and put forth very soon after the appearance of Acts; certainly before the writing of the Revelation. Indeed it seems reasonably clear that the collection and publication of them occurred between the publication of Acts and the writing of the Revelation, and a little reflection increases this probability almost to a certainty.

In the first place, we must clear our minds of the instinctive notion that from the time of their composition Paul's letters circulated freely and generally among the churches. They have done so for so long that it is difficult to realize that there was ever a time when they did not. But Paul sent his letters simply as personal letters, aimed at an immediate situation, to very definite persons, for whom alone they were meant. It is said that the younger Pliny kept copies of the letters he wrote, and revised and published them; but Paul did nothing

of that kind. Paul's letters were to him mere incidents in his absorbing task of carrying the gospel to the Greeks; and they probably seemed little more than that to most of the people to whom he sent them. A few of them were preserved, and, especially after his martyrdom, were probably read sometimes in the meetings of the churches to which they had been written. But for the most part they lay in the church chests little used. Thus only can we understand the ignorance of them which we have seen characterized the writer of Acts. The enduring values of Paul's letters would be much less apparent when the situations which called them forth were still fresh in people's minds. Their pertinence and worth would naturally seem to them tied up with the immediate occasions to which they were addressed, and they would inevitably decline in importance as these situations receded into the past.

It must also be remembered that no church had more than one or two of the letters of Paul, as we know them, from which to form an estimate of their worth. Our judgment of their worth rests on no single one of them but on a general impression of all the principal letters taken together. We think of Galatians, the twelfth chapter of Romans, and the thirteenth and fifteenth chapters of I Corinthians and recognize at once the lasting religious value of Paul's letters; but in the earliest Christian times no single church had even those three letters to judge it by.

But this oblivion into which Paul's letters were sinking is suddenly replaced by their wide currency. All

unknown to the writer of Acts, they are presently well known to the writer of the Revelation at Ephesus, the writer of Hebrews, probably in the west, and the writers of I Clement and I Peter at Rome. And they continue to be well known thenceforward. Somewhere, by someone, for some reason, they had been collected and published. What can have caused this? Do we know of any event of this time that might have led to such a step?

What but the publication of Acts? Acts gave the early church the most striking and influential portrait of Paul that has ever been drawn. That portrait must have made a great immediate impression. We may even say that Acts made Paul famous. This Paul whose figure is so dramatically rescued from its obscurity by Acts is the Paul who more than anyone else had brought the gospel to the Greeks and established Greek Christianity. A sudden revival of interest in Paul and everything pertaining to him must have resulted, especially in those churches about the Aegean, which Acts reminded its readers he had founded. One church after another would be reminded that it possessed a letter of Paul. Some traveled Christian of that circle who had heard or heard of letters of Paul surviving scattered among a few particular churches conceived the idea of assembling them for the benefit of all the churches. This is not conjecture. No fact of history is more certain than that Paul's letters were gathered into a collection. They have come down to us as a collection; and, as we have seen, we can trace that collection back to the last years of the first century. There is no possible escape from the conclusion

that somebody collected them. The only question is, what caused him to do it? It must have been done between the writing of Acts and the writing of the Revelation. What event occurred in that probably brief interval which might possibly explain the collection by supplying a motive or a stimulus for the making of it? We answer, the appearance of Acts.

It is well to remember in dealing with the books of the New Testament that the fortunes and experiences of ancient books were not wholly unlike those of modern ones, which usually make their principal impression immediately, if they make any at all, and soon fall into the background. If Acts has left little impression upon the literature of the early second century, this does not at all imply that it had not already made a strong impression when it first appeared. It was for that immediate effect on a then living public, of course, that Acts was written. The simple fact that it has survived is evidence that it did not fall stillborn from its writer's hand, but did produce such an effect upon the generation to which it was addressed.

One of its principal effects of course was to bring out the significance of Paul as the founder and pioneer of the Greek mission. Some memory of Paul of course lingered among his churches, but Acts gave definiteness and stature to a figure that had inevitably become vague with changing times and a new generation. One of the great results of the publication of Acts must have been to create a new respect and admiration for him. Greek Christianity began to feel that it owed its existence to

him, and churches here and there would be reminded that letters or fragments of letters long before written to them by him still existed in their church chests. What more natural than that these half-forgotten letters still extant scattered among the churches should awaken a new interest, and the consequent discovery of their enduring religious value should at length stir someone to undertake to assemble and edit them for the use of all the churches?

What precedent had this collector and publisher of Paul's letters for this great step, which startles us chiefly by its very modernity? Thirteen letters of Plato, most of them probably spurious, were current in collected form in much earlier times. Cicero knew them in the first century before Christ, and Plutarch toward the end of the first century after. The letters of Epicurus were in circulation in the same period. These letter collections of the Greek philosophers must have been well known when Acts was written. Not long after the writing of Acts someone collected the letters of Apollonius of Tyana, and a copy of the collection found its way into the palace of Hadrian. These letter collections were Greek, but a large collection of Cicero's letters was published by his freedman Tiro and others after his death; and not many years after the appearance of Acts, Pliny the Younger edited and published his own letters. The idea of collecting and publishing the letters of a great man was a natural and familiar one in the later years of the first century.

The great impression made by the Pauline collection as soon as it was formed and put into circulation is very clear. One of the first books to be written after its appearance was the Revelation of John. The extraordinary character of its opening section has been generally overlooked. It begins with a collection of letters, represented as dictated by Jesus, and individually addressed to seven churches of the province of Asia, a missionary field which beyond any other Paul had made his own. It is enough here to say that this virtually makes the Revelation a hybrid type of literature, half letter collection and half apocalypse. This is more than the influence of any single Pauline letter, more indeed than the influence of any two or three. It is evidently the effect of a whole collection of his letters to churches, which has so impressed the prophet John and his public that it shapes into letter-collection form the whole first division of his apocalypse. If this phenomenon does not prove the existence of the Pauline letter collection at Ephesus when the Revelation was written, one can only ask what kind of evidence would prove it?

But there is other evidence in plenty. The letter as a form of Christian instruction which had been so effective in Paul's hands now becomes again the popular mode of Christian literary expression. Hebrews, I Peter, and I Clement follow in quick succession. Hebrews was so manifestly Pauline in type that the Alexandrians actually declared it was his work, and finally persuaded the ancient church that it was. The Pauline strain in I Peter

has always been recognized. It probably owed its origin to the Pauline models which in its day were making their first collective impression on the Christian public.

If these evidences seem vague and inconclusive, I Clement is quite explicit. "Take up the letter of the blessed Paul the apostle," chapter 47 begins, "What was the first thing he wrote you, in the beginning of the gospel-preaching? Of a truth he charged you, under the Spirit's influence, concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, for even then you had formed parties." The reference to the opening paragraphs of I Corinthians is unmistakable. That letter is evidently as well known and well thought of in Rome where I Clement was written as it was in Corinth, and it can be referred to with confidence as accessible there. This is a very different situation from that which prevailed when Acts was written.

Ignatius of Antioch was taken to Rome for execution probably between A.D. 107 and 117, that is, ten or twenty years after I Clement was written. In the Letter to the Ephesians, written from Smyrna, where he and his guards were stopping on their way to Rome, he says to them that Paul "in every letter" brings them to mind. This is a difficult sentence, for Paul does not by any means mention the Ephesians in every letter, as we know his letters; and Ignatius may be alluding to the service done by the Ephesians in collecting and publishing his letters, if, as seems likely, it was they who did it, in which case every letter might indeed remind the reader of the Ephesians. But the main point for us here

is that Ignatius knows a collection of Paul's letters so considerable that he can speak of "every letter"—a phrase which naturally suggests a group of five or six at any rate. And as a matter of fact, Ignatius' letters give evidence of his acquaintance with Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians.

Ignatius' friend and contemporary, Polycarp, writing to the Philippians immediately after, says that he cannot follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul who "wrote letters to you, from the study of which you will be able to build yourselves up into the faith given you." Later in his letter, he refers again to Paul as a writer of letters: among them the blessed Paul had labored, and they "were his letters in the beginning." Polycarp in his one short letter shows acquaintance with Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and II Thessalonians.

Surely no contrast could be greater than this. From the atmosphere of Acts, where there is no trace of Paul's letters, to these earliest Apostolic Fathers, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, where the praise of them is on every tongue, is a long step. When Acts was written, they were virtually unknown. Soon after, when Clement writes, everyone knows them. Can there be any reasonable doubt what has caused this change? What could have caused it but the collection and publication of Paul's principal surviving letters?

There is no serious evidence to show that any Christian letter of instruction addressed to a church was written between the death of Paul and the appearance of

Acts. But after Acts, what an extraordinary change! A flood of just such letters begins immediately to appear. The seven letters in the Revelation, Hebrews, I Peter, I Clement, were written almost immediately; and a few years later, the seven letters of Ignatius and that of Polycarp. The publication of the collected letters of Paul to the churches had shown in a flash the great possibilities of the letter form for religious instruction, and that form was at once widely adopted by Christian leaders. There can be little doubt in view of (1) the non-acquaintance of Acts with Paul's letters and (2) the familiarity of immediately subsequent Christian writers with them that it was the publication of Acts that precipitated the collecting of them. And the more we reflect upon this the more natural and probable it becomes, for the picture of Paul in Acts would inevitably stimulate interest in any letters of his that might survive, and once attention was directed to them, the scarcity of Christian books would make the collection of them for contemporary Christian use among the Greek churches almost inevitable. Once collected and published, they easily established themselves among the classics of the new faith. Indeed, granted the initial impulse, the whole process is altogether natural and convincing; and that initial impulse can hardly have been anything but the appearance of Acts. How else should we explain its ignorance of them on the one hand and practically every later Christian writer's familiarity with them on the other?

II

EPHESIANS THE INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE COLLECTION

AMONG the letters of Paul Ephesians probably presents the greatest difficulties to the historical student. It is in many ways so unlike Paul, and yet it cannot, with Hebrews, be summarily dismissed from the Pauline collection. The chief difficulties in the way are, first, its repeated assumption of the name of Paul; second, the presence in it of much undeniably Pauline material; and third, its undoubted presence from the very first among the collected Pauline letters.

The whole tenor of the letter is out of keeping with its usual title "To the Ephesians." The persons addressed are clearly strangers to Paul. He has heard of them and their Christian faith, and he ventures to assume that they have heard of him and his ministry to the heathen. This is a most unlikely approach for Paul to make to the church at Ephesus, where he had spent nearly three years and was perfectly well known. The impression made by the body of the letter is confirmed by the discovery in our most ancient manuscripts of the true text of the salutation, from which the words "in Ephesus" are absent. According to these manuscripts, the letter is addressed to Christians generally; it is in

fact, a general letter—an encyclical written in the name of Paul.

But what situation could have led Paul to write such an encyclical to all Greek Christians everywhere? Most Pauline letters reflect with remarkable clearness the posture of affairs that called them forth; but not Ephesians. Why Paul, in prison, should have felt called upon to do this unprecedented thing, the letter does not disclose. It is one thing for the Jerusalem church to issue an encyclical like that of Acts, chapter 15; it is quite another thing for an individual Christian leader like Paul to do it. It is not like Paul, as we know him in the acknowledged letters. The style of Ephesians is also unlike him. It is more rhetorical and, compared with Paul's usual terse informal vigor, even a little cumbrous. Its great insistence upon Christian unity suggests a time in history later than that of Paul; and its description of the church as built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets come strangely from the lips of an apostle, and recalls the striking picture in the Revelation of the city's twelve foundation stones bearing the twelve names of the Lamb's twelve apostles. Indeed most historical students of Ephesians would no longer ascribe it to Paul, but rather to some follower of his, writing after A.D. 80.

The non-acquaintance of Acts with the letter, however, is a serious obstacle to this or any earlier dating. For if Ephesians was really an encyclical, meant and presumably sent to all the churches, and thus to all intents and purposes published, its disappearance from public view by the time Acts was written is an insoluble

riddle. Once actually published, a letter so religiously useful could hardly have disappeared from the life of the churches. If it is not from Paul's hand, it is much more likely to have been written shortly after Acts than shortly before it.

Moreover, it is very difficult to imagine why anyone in the 80's should have wished to put forth such an encyclical in the name of Paul. What occasion can be imagined for such an act? It necessarily implies that Paul was recognized as an apostle to the heathen and a writer of letters to churches. But if Paul's fame as a writer of letters was not established until after the publication of Acts, the impulse to take advantage of that fame to circulate this encyclical in his name must also have been subsequent to Acts' appearance. The silence of Acts is again our clue. It unmistakably points to the conclusion that Ephesians was written later than Acts.

But if no probable occasion for the writing of Ephesians can be made out in the life of Paul, nor in the years between his death and the appearance of Acts, what later situation of any greater probability can be suggested? We answer, the first collecting of Paul's letters for publication. Then if ever a Paulinist might well be moved to write in Paul's own name a general letter, introductory to the collection, which should make it plain that in a united Christianity, Paul's message to the Romans had a value to the Corinthians, and all his messages to individual churches were really for all other churches as well. In no way could this be better said than by a general letter in the name of Paul to all Christians, pointing out their

real unity in Christ, and making use of a united collection of his letters to individual churches to promote the cause of Christian unity. Here at last is a probable occasion for just such an encyclical, which, it might seem, would most appropriately be in the name of Paul. Whose name but Paul's, indeed, should stand at the beginning of the introduction to his letters?

Not only its relation to the letters of Paul but its relation to Luke and Acts favors this view of the origin of Ephesians. Its resemblances to the Lucan writings have been much discussed. They are both numerous and striking. But if Ephesians was written as an introduction to the newly formed collection of Paul's letters, and that collection arose in consequence of the publication of Luke-Acts, they would very naturally be so. The picture of Paul as a prisoner, suffering for the sake of the heathen, suggests his situation at the end of Acts as a starting point; and our first glimpses of the beginnings of Christian hymnology, after the canticles of Luke, chapters 1 and 2, are in Ephesians. There is even a suggestion of an encyclical in the Jerusalem letter of Acts 15.

The interest of Luke-Acts in harmonizing differences among Christian groups has long been recognized; indeed, Luke has been charged with unduly softening the old Jewish controversy, which Paul's letters reveal as much more acute. The answer, of course, is that when Luke wrote, the need was for reconciliation and harmony, and he wished to contribute to that end. This is also and most emphatically the aim of Ephesians. And in putting forth a literature at many points so hotly con-

troversial as the letters of Paul, its editors may well have felt the need of prefacing them with a great eirenic message which should take the bitterness and sharpness out of the old controversies, just as they transposed the third and fourth letters to Corinth, leaving only their loftier values for the churches of the new day. This is emphatically what Ephesians does. Nothing any longer divides the two great Christian groups: the wall is broken down, the two divisions are united; there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism. What more likely time can be proposed for this manifest softening of the old Pauline acerbities than when his collected letters were about to be given to the churches? At such a time, and without some fine covering message of harmony and reconciliation, those letters, some of which were veritable firebrands of controversy, might actually do more harm than good. It is the greatness of Ephesians that it supplied that eirenic interpretation and, by putting it in the mouth of Paul himself, threw the whole Pauline literature into step with the close of the century, when discord was the thing most to be feared and the call to unity was what the churches most needed. The word "unity" first occurs, in Christian literature, in Ephesians.

And what could be more natural in this great letter of introduction than to commend to its readers the Pauline letters that follow? How the great secret was made known to him by revelation, he has "just briefly written" (3:3). "As you read that," he goes on, "you will be able to understand the insight I have into the secret of Christ, ... that through union with Christ the heath-

en are fellow-heirs with the Jews, belong to the same body and share the promise with them." With these words Ephesians introduces the letters of Paul to the Christian world of its day, and transforms the letters originally addressed to individual churches into an encyclical collection, to be appropriated by all.

With such a situation the contents of Ephesians are in striking accord. It shows acquaintance with more than one of the letters of Paul. Its opening sentence, "Blessed be the God and Father of our lord Jesus Christ," is also the opening sentence of II Corinthians. Its parallels with Colossians are too numerous to mention; for much of their course the two letters run side by side. It is not too much to say that two-thirds of Colossians are reflected in Ephesians. The description of Paul as "the very least of all his people" (3:8) recalls his words in I Cor. 15:9: "the least important of the apostles, and not fit to be called an apostle." The account of the various orders in the church in Eph. 4:12—apostles, prophets, missionaries, pastors and teachers—reflects the list given in I Cor. 12:28—apostles, prophets, teachers, wonder-workers. Nor are these mere mechanical appropriations. The writer of Ephesians uses the Pauline materials with freedom and power, carrying Paul's thought on toward its goal and adapting it to his own time. His view of Christ, for example, is a development of Paul's Christology in the direction of the later Logos doctrine of John.

It has been finely said that Ephesians is a commentary on Paul. This is precisely what we might expect if

it was written in connection with the collecting of Paul's letters, to serve as an introduction to the collection.

If this view appear arbitrary or eccentric, let us survey once more the facts which, whatever our theories, confront us and must be dealt with.

1. The earliest known text of Ephesians, as given by Origen and Basil, and preserved in the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts of the fourth century, contains no mention of Ephesus in the letter itself, though the title it bore was already "To Ephesians." These oldest Greek manuscripts of it present it as a *general* letter, which had come to be known as Ephesians.

2. The contents of the letter confirm this *general* character. It is an encyclical, to all Christians everywhere, not a letter to an individual church. Least of all, to the church at Ephesus. For Paul to say to the Ephesians that they might perhaps have heard of him and his work would be no more than a pleasantry, after the years he had spent among them.

3. But when and why would Paul have written an encyclical? The mere idea of one brings us at once to a later time, when the progress of events had brought out Paul's significance for world-wide Greek Christianity. The doubt of Pauline authorship thus suggested is strikingly confirmed by the tone, style, ideas, and interests of the letter itself, which have led most critical scholars to conclude that it is not the work of Paul. That letters were eventually written in Paul's name cannot be denied. That course had a beginning, whether it be with

Ephesians, or with the later Pastorals, or only with the spurious Laodiceans.

4. Ephesians is strongly colored with material which we find in the genuine letters of Paul, some of which its writer knows and uses freely. He is the first Christian writer to do this.

5. Like the other letters of Paul, Ephesians is unknown to the writer of Acts. But this is doubly strange, for an encyclical like Ephesians, addressed to all the Pauline churches, would have twenty times the prospect of circulation and influence natural to any single letter of Paul. Its situation would be utterly different from that of a letter like I Thessalonians, definitely limited by its address and contents to a single individual church.

6. Ephesians formed part of the earliest collection of Paul's letters. In Marcion's list of ten letters, made about A.D. 140, it appears under the name of Laodiceans, a title perhaps suggested by "The letter from Laodicea" of Col. 4:16. A generation earlier Ignatius and Polycarp show acquaintance with it in their letters, written in 107–17; and the Gospel of John, written about that time, also breathes its atmosphere. It is not, therefore, like the Timothys, Titus, or Hebrews, a late addition to the Pauline *corpus,* but was evidently a part of it from the first.

These are the bald facts. They are not new; they are familiar, and I think established. We may dislike them and attempt to explain them away. But truth will probably be better served if we try to live with them and understand what they mean. The letter is not to Ephesus;

it is a general letter. It is not by Paul, yet it contains much that is from Paul; and it had a place in the first Pauline collection.

What is the meaning of these familiar facts? How can they be reconciled and related to one another? The question is, When and why should anyone else have written a general letter in Paul's name? We answer, When his letters were first being collected and published, and in order to introduce the individual letters to the rest of the churches to which they had not been originally addressed. Then for the first time would a Christian writer have the chief Pauline letters before him; then if ever would he be moved to claim the name of Paul; then most naturally a Pauline encyclical would be in order; then and never after could such a letter take its place in the first Pauline collection. The case seems very clear: not earlier, for then the collected letters would not have been available; not later, for then the product could not have found a place in the earliest published collection of Paul's letters. Evidently then as a part of the first collecting and editing process. As what part? Obviously as introduction. What other part could a general letter in the name of Paul to all Christian churches everywhere naturally take? But have we any evidence that such a collection of letters to churches would be given such a covering letter as introduction? Yes, the most startling evidence, from that very time: the letters to the seven churches in the Revelation are introduced by a general covering letter (1:4–20) to all seven. In the light of that letter, it would really be

strange if the earlier Pauline collection was put forth without a general letter of introduction.

The Pauline collection was probably entitled simply "Letters of Paul," as we still find it called in the earliest extant manuscripts. Under this, and without a title of its own, probably stood what we know as Ephesians. Its lack of a precise title, like those of the other letters, would presently invite, in later editions of it, such conjectural titles, as "To the Ephesians," or "To the Laodiceans"—the latter perhaps following the hint of Col. 4:16; the former probably influenced by the name of the church which had formed and circulated the collection. Ignatius himself could say to the Ephesians fifteen or twenty years later that Paul in every letter brought them to mind. No church was as centrally located for assembling the Pauline letters that we have as Ephesus and no church had a better right, especially in the light of Acts, to stand forth as his spokesman and literary executor. Is the writing of Ephesians in the name of Paul psychologically more difficult than the composition of the Pauline speeches in the book of Acts, itself a work very probably produced in the Ephesian circle? For Acts reports no such touching parting from any other church as Paul's farewell to the Ephesian elders, in chapter 20.

Ephesians thus not only introduced the collected letters to the churches of its day but was (with the possible exception of the letter of Acts, chapter 15) the first Christian encyclical; indeed, it made the whole Pauline collection one great encyclical, every part of which was meant for all the churches; and it was the beginning of Christian pseudepigraphy.

III

THE PAULINE COLLECTION REFLECTED IN THE REVELATION

IT IS in one sense a pity that all our interpreters and investigators of the Revelation have been familiar with it from childhood. This must be the explanation of the singular fact that they have taken as a matter of course what must inevitably have struck a stranger as the strangest feature of the book—that it began with a *corpus* of letters to churches. This is in fact the most distinctive thing about the structure of the Revelation. Other—Jewish—apocalypses use similar imagery. Other Christian revelations make similar claims. But the Revelation of John is unique in presenting to the beholder this extraordinary façade—a portal of seven letters to individual churches, introduced by a general covering letter to all the seven. This feature, beyond any other, calls for explanation, more especially since the collection is no true one, made up of actual letters previously written, for the collection is written as a whole. The writer is not collecting his own scattered individual letters for republication to a wider circle, the seven churches; he is writing, *de novo* and all at once, a whole collection of letters to churches, and strangely enough using it to preface a very different type of literature, an apocalypse.

That he should have done this without ever having

seen a collection of Christian letters to churches is so unlikely as to be almost unthinkable. The plain meaning of the eight letters is rather this: The writer knows a collection of Christian letters to churches, and has been greatly impressed by it. So greatly indeed, that, although his chosen literary form is the apocalypse, a type of very definite character, he actually swerves at the very outset to the form of a letter collection, of which he is the amanuensis, and retains this form through almost the first fifth of his work. The result is a hybrid type of literature, mainly apocalypse but partly and most conspicuously letter collection.

It is idle to suggest that the presence of a letter at the end of the Apocalypse of Baruch is a precedent for this. That is a single letter, to the nine and a half tribes, at the end of the work; what we have here is a *corpus* of letters, to Christian churches, at the beginning of one. Moreover the best critical opinion about Baruch is that it is not earlier than the Revelation of John, but was written in the closing years of the first century. It is not a matter of a single letter here or there but of a very different thing—a collection of letters, and of letters to Christian churches.

The Muratorian writer remarks that Paul like John wrote to seven churches. Modern historical study would invert the order, but the coincidence remains striking. It is, of course, more than a coincidence; it is a reflection. To see in it less than this would be to shut our eyes to massive literary facts and still hope to find slender ones to build on.

Here again habit has blinded us to the broad facts of the case. We have always known the Pauline *corpus,* and have difficulty in thinking of a time when it did not already exist. We instinctively feel that such a work must always have lain within the reach of early Christian writers. Collections of the thirteen letters of Plato, of the letters of Epicurus, and in Latin of those of Cicero were indeed known in New Testament times, which also witnessed the collection of the letters of Apollonius and the publication, in Latin of course, of those of the younger Pliny. But it was not the collections of the letters of Plato or of Epicurus that were before the mind of the writer of the Revelation. His model was clearly a collection of Christian letters, and of letters to churches. This can only have been the Pauline *corpus*—unless we really think it likely that the writing of a whole new letter collection, as a unit, actually preceded the collecting of scattered letters previously written. Between the orders

I. The writing of Paul's letters;
Their disappearance;
The writing of the letter collection of the Revelation;
The collecting of Paul's letters;
and II. The writing of Paul's letters;
Their disappearance;
The collecting of them;
The writing of the letter collection of the Revelation,

there can hardly be more than a moment's hesitation.

The fact is, the letters to the seven churches are really not seven letters but one. There is but one letter

salutation, and it stands at the beginning of the introductory or covering letter, in the first chapter. Each letter, aside from certain local details, is therefore obviously meant for all seven. Why then were they not all written to all the churches? Because the Pauline *corpus* had disclosed almost by accident the incidental values of the other method. Nothing could more eloquently reveal the profound impression made by the Pauline collection when it first broke upon the consciousness of the early churches.

But strangely enough we are not left to mere general probabilities. An extraordinary coincidence of language arrests us on the very threshold of the letter to the seven churches. "Grace and peace to you," runs John's salutation. What could be more natural? we say. But what makes this salutation seem so natural to us? Probably the same thing that made it seem natural to John: Its regular use in the early letters of Paul.

And nowhere else! The ordinary Greek epistolary salutation is the infinitive of the verb "rejoice," sometimes accompanied by the superlative adverb "most." It may be rendered "Greetings!" or "Heartiest greetings!" It occurs in the simpler form in hundreds of papyrus letters; but in the New Testament only in Acts, to introduce the letters of 15:23 and 23:26, and in Jas. 1:1. The letters to Timothy have "Grace, mercy, peace"; I and II Peter, "Grace to you and peace be multiplied"; Jude, "Mercy to you and peace and love be multiplied"; II John, "Grace, mercy, peace shall be with us"; Titus, "Grace and peace."

If we widen our survey to include other early Christian letters, the result is the same. The salutation of I Clement is of the same type as that in I Peter. Ignatius usually employs the ordinary Greek style common in the papyri, which he uses in the strengthened form: "Heartiest greetings." Polycarp is more like Jude than any other: "Mercy to you and peace be multiplied." Barnabas has a curious salutation resembling an informal, familiar one found in papyrus letters from parents to children or children to parents: "Rejoice, sons and daughters."

Of the ten forms of epistolary salutations listed above, the Revelation alone employs just that of the first great group of Paul's letters: Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Philemon—and Ephesians. This can hardly be dismissed as mere coincidence. It is evidently the direct influence of the Pauline models upon the writer of the letter *corpus* of the Revelation, and confirms the broad general impression made by the seven-fold letter as a whole, that the writer of it has before him the collected letters of Paul and is strongly influenced by their form.

Whether this influence can be traced farther than the first three chapters of the Revelation is a serious question. Certainly in his attitude toward the Roman authority the prophet of the Revelation differs much from Paul, who in Romans particularly instructed his readers to obey the civil authorities, in whom the prophet of the Revelation now sees the allies of Satan himself.

This does not necessarily mean that John did not know what Paul had written in Romans, but only that when John writes, Rome has taken a different attitude toward the churches from the one Paul associated with it. Indeed one of John's aims may have been to bring about a change from Paul's view on this matter.

In one particular Luke-Acts, Ephesians, and the Revelation show a close relationship of a very distinctive kind. In them the liturgical interest appears and rapidly develops. Walter Pater long ago pointed out the genius for liturgy that characterized the early church. It shows itself first in the hymns in the early chapters of Luke—the *Magnificat,* the *Gloria in excelsis,* the *Benedictus,* and the *Nunc dimittis.* Ephesians, written as we have seen at about the same time has its snatch of Christian song:

> Wake up, sleeper!
> Rise from the dead,
> And Christ will dawn upon you!

And in the choruses, arias, and antiphonies of the Revelation this new interest reaches its first climax. The development of Christian hymnology had consciously begun.

The interest of the Revelation in the twelve apostles as giving their names to the twelve foundation stones of the wall of the heavenly city clearly echoes the high esteem of the apostles already expressed in Ephesians: "You are built upon the apostles and prophets as your

foundation." Its insistence indeed upon their number as twelve seems to exclude Paul from the list, but its whole character as a prophetic revelation makes it the most impressive interpretation of the prophet's place in the Christian foundations that early Christianity affords. It is almost as though its writer felt that if the apostles, in the person of Paul, were making so massive a contribution to Christian books, the Christian prophets must utter their message in writing as well as by word of mouth. The whole work may thus be viewed as a prophet's response to the literary challenge implicit in the publication of the letters of the apostle. Paul's collected letters were showing the way to the literary expression of Christianity.

In short, in its liturgical interest and its high esteem for the apostles, the Revelation shows the atmosphere of Luke-Acts and Ephesians, while its letter *corpus* and its form of epistolary salutation are unmistakably reminiscent of the letter collection of Paul. But that letter collection was unknown to the writer of Luke-Acts, as it had also been to the authors of Mark and Matthew. It must therefore have been made and put into circulation between the publication of Acts and the writing of the opening chapters of the Revelation of John.

We have thought too much of the letters of Paul as individual units, and too little of them in their corporate capacity. But their influence as units was relatively slight; it was only when they emerged in a body that their great effectiveness began. Of their corporate exist-

ence our first clear reflection is seen in the opening pages of the Revelation. This fact enables us on purely literary grounds to date the publication of the collection in the year or years immediately following the publication of Luke-Acts and preceding the Revelation of John.

IV

THE PAULINE COLLECTION THE BACKGROUND OF THE LATER CHRISTIAN LETTERS

WE HAVE sought to show that the letters of Paul were first collected as a result of the impression made by the picture of him drawn in the Acts; that the letter known to us as Ephesians was a general letter, written as an introduction to the collected letters to commend them to the churches generally; and that the collection, including this introductory letter, is strikingly reflected in the letter collection that forms the first part of the Revelation of John.

If this be true, it goes far to explain the next phase of early Christian literature—the epistolary. With a whole collection of nine or ten Pauline letters assembled before them, and showing conclusively the possibilities of the letter form for instructing the churches, that form was bound to revive. And that is precisely what happened. Apart, perhaps, from Acts, chapter 15, we do not possess a single Christian letter, except the nine of Paul, which there is good historical reason for dating before A.D. 90. But after that the situation is completely changed. The appearance of the Pauline *corpus* is the signal for a shower of Christian letters to churches.

1. There is, to begin with, the Revelation of John,

usually thought of as pure apocalypse, yet so evidently produced under the shadow of the Pauline *corpus* that it begins with a miniature letter collection of its own, introduced by a general covering letter which opens with the regular and distinctive Pauline form of salutation. The more we reflect upon this letter collection in the Revelation the clearer it becomes that it is an imitation, not of separate scattered letters, but of a unified collection of letters beginning with a general introductory letter, for the several letters have no individual formulas of salutation, but assume the one that stands at the beginning of the introductory letter. They are, in short, not seven distinct letters, but seven messages forming parts of one letter which was addressed to all the seven. The writer of the Revelation evidently no longer thinks of the letters of Paul as detached individual units; for him they are a unified collection, with an introductory letter covering them all and introducing them to all Christians everywhere.

2. We have next the Epistle to the Hebrews, now generally regarded as a letter written to the Roman church. It suggests Paul's influence so strongly that half the ancients actually believed he wrote it. Others said it was written by some follower of his under his influence, and this is probably the fact; only the influence was not immediate and personal, but exerted through Paul's collected letters. It does not mention Paul, but it is probably alluding to Peter and Paul when in 13: 7 it urges the Romans to remember their former leaders and their martyrdoms; it is in this sense that these words seem to

be understood by the writer of I Clement in chapter 5. Heb. 11 glorifies Paul's central principle of faith in a form reminiscent of 1 Cor. 13, and 1 Cor. 10: 1–11 is reflected in Heb. 3: 16 ff. Hebrews was clearly written under the spur of the newly published Pauline *corpus,* but mainly out of the writer's own thought and experience.

3. I Peter, a work of Roman Christianity, probably from the time of Domitian, gives further evidence of the extending influence of the Pauline-letter type. In I Peter the Roman church begins to do that work of instructing the churches to which the Epistle to the Hebrews had so boldly challenged it. Hebrews had told the Roman Christians that fine as their record was for hospitality, beneficence, and heroism in persecution, they had failed to teach the churches, and actually needed to have someone impart to them the very rudiments of the faith. Perhaps it was the very achievement of Ephesus in this direction in the recent publication of the Pauline letters that gave occasion and point to this criticism. In I Peter and I Clement, both clearly Roman works, and written probably in the last years of Domitian, the Roman church sets about remedying this defect. The result is that fifteen or twenty years later Ignatius can say to them, "You have taught others." But what had suggested to the Roman church the use of letters as the most promising means for this desired instruction? The letter collection of Paul.

The direct influence of the Pauline collection upon I Peter is very marked. "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ," recalls the first words of Ephesians. The Paul-

inism of the letter has often been noted. The influence of Romans and Ephesians especially is unmistakable. I Peter's attitude to the Roman authority is that of Romans, chapter 13, not that of the Revelation; and I Peter, after the salutation, actually begins with the very words of II Corinthians and Ephesians: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." I Peter's outline of Christian duties (servants, wives, husbands) strongly resembles that of Ephesians (wives, husbands, children, fathers, slaves, masters). Its allusion to Rome as "Babylon" recalls the symbolism of the Revelation, and it is very probable that it was written mainly to correct the seditious attitude to Rome inculcated in the Revelation and to recall the churches to the nobler disposition advocated by Paul in Romans. It is a striking fact that I Peter is a general letter addressed to a large but definitely limited group of Christians—those of Asia Minor. In reaching them, it would offset the dangerous influence of the Revelation, which was addressed to the churches of Asia—that is, the Roman province of that name, which formed the western part of Asia Minor. But I Peter is not, like the Revelation, addressed to churches; but, like Ephesians, to individuals. The influence of that encyclical appears in modified form in both I Peter and the Revelation. They are, like it, within certain limits at least, general letters.

Why the Roman church should have taken it upon itself thus early to write to a whole section of the Christian public in the name of Peter is a difficult question, but even upon that question some light is thrown by the

situation we have already surveyed. If Ephesian Christians had felt authorized to write an encyclical in the name of Paul, and an Ephesian prophet had felt justified in writing a general letter to the churches of Asia in the name of Christ, it is not inconceivable that the church at Rome should feel justified in writing a general letter to the Christians of Asia Minor in the name of Peter. It was in Rome that Peter had suffered martyrdom, and there the scene of his death was piously venerated. There is good reason to think that the gospel of Mark was written at Rome, probably in some measure to embody the memoirs of Peter. Certainly that idea prevailed early in the second century, and it implies a certain disposition on the part of the Roman church to assume the right to speak for Peter. As the scene of his last ministry and of his martyrdom, and as the custodian of his tomb and shrine, the Roman church might, from the ancient point of view, claim to be the heir and spokesman of Peter, that is, to say from time to time what it might assume its patron apostle might have said to the successive situations that arose. Other motives may have animated the Preaching of Peter and the Revelation of Peter, early in the second century, and II Peter and the Gospel of Peter, toward the middle of it. But this pseudepigraphical literature bearing the name of Peter must have had a beginning, and that beginning was clearly I Peter.

But if the Roman church had already sponsored the Gospel of Mark, and felt itself entitled to speak for Peter, just as Ephesus had so recently done for Paul and even for Christ, the situation created by the successive

appearances of the Acts, the Pauline collection, the Revelation, and Hebrews might well have called forth a general letter in his name. Acts had pointedly revived interest in Peter as well as Paul; the Pauline collection had showed the extraordinary possibilities of the letter of Christian instruction; Revelation had spread a bitter and seditious attitude toward the emperor among the churches of Asia; and Hebrews had called upon the Roman church to rise to its responsibilities of Christian leadership by teaching the churches. The first teaching the hour demanded was a sounder attitude toward the Empire, even in the face of bitter persecution. But if its call to honor the emperor is to be heard, in the face of the great claims of the prophet of Ephesus—the amanuensis of Jesus himself—a greater name than that of any living Roman Christian must begin the letter; and, as Ephesus had used that of Paul, Rome adopts that of Peter.

4. I Clement, a letter of the Roman church to the Corinthians, contains the first definite and explicit reference to any letter of Paul that has come down to us: "Take up the letter of the blessed Paul the apostle. What was the first thing he wrote you in the beginning of the gospel-preaching?" An unmistakable allusion to I Corinthians, chapter 1, follows. I Corinthians has evidently been published and is a recognized matter of common knowledge between Corinth and Rome. I Clement also shows acquaintance with Ephesians and Romans. Directly and indirectly, the influence of the Pauline collection upon it is very strong.

But much more important here is the influence of the Pauline letter style, the value of which the publication of the Pauline letters had made so apparent. I Clement is the work of a mediocre man making a prodigious effort. What it lacks in greatness it makes up in length. Its writer is straining after his models, the letters of Paul. It is a curious fact that Clement's letter to the Corinthians is half again as long as Paul's first letter to them, and not much shorter than Paul's two letters to Corinth combined. The influence of the more recent Epistle to the Hebrews upon I Clement is very great. I have long felt that I Clement was written under the spur of the challenge to Christian leadership flung at the Roman church by the writer of Hebrews, and that this fact explains many strange features of Clement.

The resemblance of I Clement to I Peter is also one of its most notable features. Their epistolary salutations, "Grace to you and peace be multiplied," are alike, except that I Clement adds (or as the Greek reads, inserts) "from God Omnipotent through Jesus Christ." "Omnipotent" is a word once quoted in II Corinthians from Amos, but first made familiar in Christian literature through the Revelation. I Clement uses it almost as often. I Clement and I Peter agree in speaking of Christians as only sojourning in this world, which recalls Heb. 11:13. Both write on behalf of the church at Rome, I Clement explicitly, and I Peter in sending the greetings of "your sister church in Babylon" (5:13). Both exalt Peter and urge obedience to the elders of the church. All this and much more make it likely that

I Peter and I Clement are both letters from the Roman church to its sister churches in the east, written under the spur of the call of Hebrews and the example of Ephesus in publishing Paul's letters. What is most clear is that the writers of both letters are familiar with Paul's collected letters, and write under their direct influence.

5. Of the letters of John, the first is a general letter, originally intended for a particular circle of churches in Asia but as published meant for all churches everywhere. The second is a letter to a church, and the third is to an individual. These latter are short, being about the length of Philemon. Of some interest historically, the second and third letters add almost nothing religiously to the first. Their combination with it builds it up, however, from the status of a single letter to that of a collection, and a collection that reflects in miniature the great Pauline one, which must at that time have consisted of an encyclical, some church letters, and a personal letter. It is worth noting that all three types are represented here.

6. From Ignatius of Antioch, A.D. 107–17, we have a whole collection of letters, in various ways reminiscent of those of Paul. Ignatius, the head of the church at Antioch, has been condemned to death and is being taken to Rome for martyrdom. At Smyrna he is met by representatives of the neighboring churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles; and he writes to each of these churches a letter about as long as I or II Thessalonians, full of stirring Christian exhortation. From the same place he writes to the church at Rome. Later at Troas

he writes to the churches at Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna. The average length of these letters is about that of II Thessalonians. It is an interesting fact that Ignatius emerges from literary obscurity for a few days only, and only as he is passing through those churches of Asia in which, of all places in the Christian world, literary expression was then most active. There, in the home of the Pauline collection, Ignatius, who had probably known the Pauline letters for years, is somehow stirred to do for his generation, in so far as he can, the Pauline service of religious instruction by means of letters to churches. Ignatius doubtless wrote other letters, before and after his passage through Asia. The curious and significant thing is that it is only his letters written in Asia that were collected and preserved. This argues an especial interest in such enterprises just there, and at a time midway between the collecting of Paul's letters and the collecting of the Four Gospels.

The influence of the Pauline *corpus* upon Ignatius is obvious. Ignatius says to the Ephesians that Paul "in every letter mentions you" (or "brings you to mind"). They are fellow-initiates of Paul, in whose footsteps Ignatius says he hopes to follow. Ignatius is thoroughly conscious that he is soon to suffer martyrdom in the very city which was already hallowed as the scene of the martyrdoms of Paul and Peter. He disclaims any thought of comparing himself with them, but in that act he betrays the fact that such a comparison has occurred to him. "I do not enjoin you as Peter and Paul did.

They were apostles, I am a convict." It is clear that in writing his letters Ignatius is seeking to take the utmost advantage of his position as a Christian confessor, condemned and all but a martyr, to urge his message upon the churches. We have already seen that Ignatius shows acquaintance with Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians.

7. His friend and contemporary, Polycarp, says in his letter to the Philippians that he "cannot follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who . . . . when he was absent wrote letters to you, from the study of which you will be able to build yourselves up into the faith given you." He again refers to Paul as a writer of letters in chapter 11. Polycarp shows acquaintance with Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and II Thessalonians. Polycarp wrote from Smyrna, the second of the Seven Churches of Asia, and not far from Ephesus. His letter was written in answer to one from the Philippians asking him for any letters of Ignatius he could send them. Polycarp could easily have answered them with a brief note, but instead he takes occasion to address a little homily of Christian instruction to them. It is this that shows the extraordinary and sustained influence of the Pauline letter collection. Polycarp's letter, written to accompany the first collection of the letters of Ignatius, reminds us of the kindred service rendered by Ephesians in introducing the collected letters of Paul to an earlier and wider public.

8. The letters to Timothy and Titus are so clearly modeled upon the original letters of Paul, under the in-

fluence of the Acts, that they need only be mentioned here, as part of the flood of letters that the Pauline *corpus* evoked. In Titus, "Paul, a slave of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ," at once recalls the opening words of Romans: "Paul, a slave of Jesus Christ, called as an apostle." II Timothy begins just as II Corinthians, Colossians, and Ephesians do: "Paul, by God's will an apostle of Christ Jesus." The opening of I Timothy is: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by order of God our Savior." The ostensible direction of the three letters to individuals, not churches, reminds us that there was one letter to an individual, Philemon, in the Pauline *corpus,* although that letter is really to Philemon and Apphia and Archippus and the church that met in Philemon's house, and may at first have been thought of as a church letter. The salutation "Grace, mercy, peace," in the letters to Timothy is peculiar. There are frequent echoes of Acts, like that in II Tim. 3:11. The influence of the original letters of Paul upon the group is too manifest to call for description, although later writings like Acts and Hebrews and current religious conditions have greatly modified the Pauline ideas.

It is very probable that these three letters were written as a collection. There is no evidence of the separate circulation of any one of them; they are very much of a kind; and their atmosphere seems to be that of the conflict with the sects that marked the second quarter of the second century. This outweighs the supposed echoes of them in Polycarp, which are probably either common quotations of earlier proverbial expressions or possibly

echoes in the Pastorals of ideas expressed in Polycarp.

9. James, Jude, and II Peter are general letters, addressed to all Christians, very much in the fashion of Ephesians. Jude and II Peter were clearly written as letters; but James seems to have been composed as a homily and then made into a letter by prefixing a salutation in the true Greek form, addressing it to Christians everywhere. What was the idea of publishing it in this way? Can we doubt that it was to give to this little homily something of the currency and influence that Paul's letters enjoyed and exerted? They had made the letter form classical for the purposes of Christian instruction, and the general letter that introduced them was the original Christian encyclical.

Even as a homily, James shows plainly enough the influence of the Pauline letters. Its famous antithesis between faith and works is but the shadow cast by the great arguments of Paul. The influence of Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, and probably Ephesians upon James is recognized.

The indirect influence of the Pauline *corpus* upon James through I Peter is also very clear. Others have pointed out that its address "To the twelve tribes of the dispersion" is probably an abbreviated form of the address of I Peter: "To the elect who are sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia." The resemblances of James and I Peter are numerous and have been much discussed. One is certainly full of echoes of the other, but how shall we decide

which is primary and which secondary; that is, on which side the indebtedness lies? Two considerations present themselves: (1) The address of James seems derived from that of I Peter, probably under the influence of the wider public envisaged in the address of Ephesians: "To God's people who are steadfast in Christ Jesus." (2) The rather pallid Christology of James, which has almost nothing to say of Jesus, and in fact hardly mentions him, points to a later time than that of I Peter, rather suggesting that of Hermas, A.D. 120–40.

But whatever the relationship of James and I Peter, their common debt to the collected letters of Paul cannot be questioned; and it is more than probable that James owes the letter form it finally assumed to the joint influence of Ephesians and I Peter.

10. Jude is also a Christian encyclical, most probably to be explained as another effort to make use for religious and doctrinal purposes of the general-letter form inaugurated by Ephesians. Its salutation somewhat resembles those of I Peter and I Clement, and its quotation from the Book of Enoch recalls the probable reference to that work in I Pet. 3:19.

11. Barnabas, who about A.D. 130 put his strange message into the form of a letter, and apparently an encyclical, for it is addressed simply to "sons and daughters," shows acquaintance with Romans and Ephesians.

12. II Peter is the first book in the New Testament to refer definitely to the collected letters of Paul:

> Look upon our Lord's patience as salvation, as our dear brother Paul, with the wisdom that God gave him, wrote you to do,

speaking of it as he does in all his letters. There are some things in them hard to understand, which ignorant, unsteadfast people twist to their own ruin, just as they do the rest of the scriptures.

The warning against the misuse of Paul's letters strongly suggests the times of Marcion, toward 140. The writer gives clear evidence of acquaintance with the collected gospels, while his reference to I Peter and his use of Jude, which virtually forms his second chapter, place him quite definitely, in the course of Christian literature. His salutation is naturally like that of I Peter, but generalized like that of Ephesians to include all Christians everywhere. The use of Pauline models, direct and indirect, is plain.

13. The recently discovered Epistle of the Apostles, written probably soon after the middle of the second century, in the name of the eleven apostles (among them Nathanael, and both Peter and Cephas!) is an encyclical composed by someone familiar with the Four Gospels and Acts and interested to relate Paul and his gentile mission to the original apostles and their work. The influence of Paul's letters upon the work is therefore evident. It is, in fact, in part an effort to offset the commanding position secured to Paul by his collected letters, introduced by an encyclical, by putting forth an encyclical letter on behalf of the primitive apostles as a group. It is really an apocalypse in the form of a letter.

14. The Martyrdom of Polycarp is also in form a letter from the church at Smyrna to that at Philomelium giving an account of the death of Polycarp, who was burned at Smyrna in A.D. 155 or 156, about which time

the letter must have been written. While it is primarily addressed to the church at Philomelium, it includes in its address all Christian communities everywhere and is therefore really, like Ephesians, an encyclical. Its salutation is reminiscent of both Jude and I Clement.

The presence in this flood of Christian letters of so many encyclicals makes it extremely probable that the Pauline collection which underlies this whole movement, was itself introduced by an encyclical and was thus virtually made encyclical as a whole.

The influence of the Pauline *corpus* as a collection upon the literary forms of the generation that followed its formation is evidenced not only by the surprising revival of the letter form of religious instruction but by the appearance of other letter collections, which show every sign of its direct influence.

1. The first of these is, of course, that which begins the Revelation of John, in the general scope and structure of which we have already seen the earlier Pauline *corpus* mirrored. How perfect that mirroring is forms an interesting subject for inquiry. There is good reason to believe that in beginning with a general introductory letter to all the churches concerned, and following this with individual messages for the several churches, the letter collection of the Revelation fairly reflects the Pauline *corpus* in miniature. Did that *corpus* contain seven letters (like that of Ignatius afterward) or more probably, letters to seven churches (like that of the Revelation)? It must have been seven fold, in one sense or the other, for both the Revelation and the Igna-

tius collections are, and both were produced under its influence.

2. It is more difficult to speak of the Letters of John, for the history of that little group is far from clear. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the Johannine letters, if they were not written as a group, were gathered into one soon after they were written; and the influence of the great Pauline collection upon this fourth collection of Christian letters is obvious. They reflect Asian Christianity, which had formed the earlier collections of Paul and of the Revelation, which arose within the circle of Ephesian influence, as the collection of the letters of John doubtless did. It may not be superfluous to point out that this little Johannine group, like the great Pauline *corpus*, begins with an encyclical, and ends with an individual letter, with a church letter between. It is thus in type a completely representative letter collection, in miniature, after the Pauline pattern.

3. The letters of Ignatius form the third collection in which the influence of the Pauline *corpus* can be traced. The origin of it is reported probably fairly enough in the letter of Polycarp, who seems to have been the assembler of it. He writes to the Philippians:

> We send you, as you asked, the letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others which we had by us. They are subjoined to this letter, and you will be able to benefit greatly by them. . . . . Let us know anything further that you have heard about Ignatius himself and those who are with him.

These are extraordinary observations, for they show that although Polycarp has not yet had any certain news

of the martyrdom of Ignatius at Rome, he or someone else has already collected the letters of Ignatius and is circulating copies of them among the churches. Why this unseemly haste in collecting and publishing the letters of this Christian confessor from Antioch, without even waiting for his martyrdom? Is it not evident that they are hastening to do for Ignatius what had previously been done for that greater martyr Paul? The Pauline *corpus* is the explanation of the Ignatian one. It is worth noting that this third letter collection, as Eusebius knew it, and as we have it today, includes seven letters: six of them to churches, Ephesus and Rome among them; and one to an individual—Polycarp. There is no covering or introductory letter here, unless Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, quoted above, served that purpose in a limited way.

4. The Pastoral *corpus,* I and II Timothy and Titus, developed, or was written, all at once, very evidently under the influence of the Pauline collection, with which it was combined toward the close of the second century to make a collection of thirteen letters—just the number in the *corpus* of Plato's letters. It is the most indubitable child of the Pauline collection.

5. What had once been done for Paul was later done or attempted for the other apostles as a group; and in the latter part of the second century we find the beginnings of the Catholic *corpus*—I Peter, I and II (and probably III) John, and Jude. Not until the third century did it reach full stature, in the New Testament of Origen, where our present group of seven Catholic let-

ters first appears. Origen indeed admitted Barnabas also to it, and Clement of Alexandria had included I Clement also; but the Catholic *corpus* came to rest, suggestively enough, with a collection of seven letters, and of these only four are Catholic in the sense of being encyclicals.

All these are Christian letter collections. They consist for the most part of letters to churches—though some are encyclicals—and a few letters to individuals. There was precedent for each of these types in the early forms of the Pauline collection. We might reasonably add the great collection of the Four Gospels, probably formed at Ephesus, in some degree on account of the success already achieved by the Pauline letter collection. We must not too easily assume that the Four Gospels were sure to find one another anyway, or that anyone might have thought of putting them together. Putting them together was a much less natural and obvious thing than putting Paul's letters together had been, and it is altogether probable that the one is the direct sequel of the other. Certain it is that in the second century to an extraordinary degree Christian literature develops by collections.

Is not this an amazing showing? With twenty-five letters and five letter collections, the thing really becomes an avalanche. The letter collections of John the prophet, of John the elder, of Ignatius, the Pastorals, the Catholics are all lesser imitations of the great initial collection of the letters of Paul, which thus had its influence not only in individual efforts here and there in the

church-letter style but even more clearly in this series of Christian letter collections which stud the century that follows.

In all this secondary letter literature, from Ephesians on, we observe the more formal, less vigorous quality of an imitative literature, at its best indeed in Ephesians and I Peter, but never attaining the sheer strength of thought and sharpness of historical situation so marked in the actual letters of Paul. Of this imitative movement the letters of Paul, collected and published, are the essential background.

The new impulse and direction given to Christian literature by the publication of Paul's letters cannot be mistaken. Before that event, Christian writing was taking the form of gospels and historical accounts (Mark, Matthew, Luke, Acts). Then came the publication of Paul's collected letters, and then a shower of "letters" or epistles, almost to the exclusion of other literary types.

The publication of the Pauline collection in short set a fashion in Christian literature which more or less closely shaped the Revelation, Hebrews, I Clement, I Peter, and the letters of Ignatius, Polycarp, and John in the twenty years that followed, and continued to operate hardly less powerfully for a generation longer; witness James (a homily made into an encyclical letter under the influence of the Pauline *corpus*), Barnabas, Jude, II Peter (these three also encyclicals), and the letters to Timothy and Titus. Indeed the principal exception to the epistolary style in this period is the Gospel of John,

of which the Pauline collection is the manifest background and which shows the influence of almost every letter in it.

It was precisely the later assembling of the Four Gospels into a collection that drew attention to the possibilities of that form of Christian literature and led to such works as the Gospel of Peter and the later gospels of James, Thomas, and others. Just as the collection of the Pauline letters led to a flood of other Christian letters, the collection of the Four Gospels led to the writing of almost a score of later gospels. In all this literary movement we must distinguish the influence of a given letter or gospel, by itself, from the influence of the same document gathered into a collection and buttressed by a mass of kindred documents. It was not until Paul's letters and the earliest gospels passed into their respective collections that they began to exert their full influence.

And if the overwhelming majority of the early Christian literature that followed the publication of Paul's collected letters was written in the presence and more or less under the influence of the collection, then it follows that they can be successfully interpreted only in the light of that fact. These observations, if they be sound, have the highest importance for interpretation for this whole mass of later literature.

Let us glance in conclusion at the sheer bulk of this secondary letter literature, called forth by the publication of the first collection of the letters of Paul, in comparison with the earlier literature.

50–62	70–90	90–160
Paul's letters:	Mark,	Ephesians
		Revelation (7 letters)
Thessalonians, I, II	Matthew	Hebrews
		I Peter
Galatians	Luke-Acts	I Clement
		I John
Corinthians, I, II		II John
		III John
Romans		Ignatius, Ephesians
		Magnesians
Philippians		Trallians
		Romans
Colossians		Philadelphians
		Smyrnaeans
Philemon		Polycarp
		Polycarp, Philippians
		James
		Jude
		I Timothy
		II Timothy
		Titus
		Barnabas
		II Peter
		Epistle of Apostles
		Martyrdom of Polycarp

This makes twenty-four letters after Ephesians, or thirty, if we count the letters in the Revelation as seven.

V

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST PAULINE COLLECTION

WE HAVE seen that the "Letters of Paul," as the oldest manuscripts entitle them, were first collected soon after the publication of Acts, and published with what we know as Ephesians prefixed to serve as introduction to Christians everywhere. The argument already presented has important bearings upon the question of what letters this original collection contained and what early changes it underwent.

The list of the letters that made up the collection can be gathered from the reflections of them in the letters of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp and from Ephesians itself, which naturally throws light upon the collection which it was written to introduce. From these four very early sources it is clear that it contained letters to six churches: Colossians, Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Romans, and Thessalonians. The idea that II Corinthians was absent from the collection in its earliest form must be given up, in view of the evident influence of its first sentence upon the corresponding ones in Ephesians and I Peter. The presence of II Thessalonians is also clearly indicated; and as it can hardly have circulated without I Thessalonians, both were doubtless in the collection.

We may therefore be sure that after the introductory encyclical—our Ephesians—the original collection included at least eight letters, addressed to six churches. This is almost exactly the list adopted by Marcion, about A.D. 140, except that he included Philemon and called Ephesians "Laodiceans," which would give a total of ten letters, to seven churches and one individual.

This raises the question of the place and name of Philemon in the original collection. It usually passes for a letter to an individual, but it is actually addressed to "our dear fellow-worker Philemon and our sister Apphia and our fellow-soldier Archippus, and the church that meets in your house." It is thus in form another church letter. Is it the "letter from Laodicea" mentioned at the end of Colossians? That is not impossible. The passage in Colossians reads: "Remember me to the brothers in Laodicea and to Nympha and the church that meets in her house. When this letter has been read to you, have it read to the church at Laodicea also, and see that you read the letter that is coming from there. And tell Archippus, 'See that you perform the Christian service you have been assigned.'" This sounds as though Archippus were at Laodicea and, if he was, "Philemon" was sent to that place.

A number of considerations enter into the problem. Probably seven churches were addressed in the letters of the first Pauline *corpus*. The tradition that seven churches were written to by Paul is marked, in the second century, and the letters of Revelation shows a contemporary interest in such a number; indeed they proba-

bly directly reflect that feature of the Pauline collection. A personal letter, especially so short a letter as Philemon, is something like an impertinence in such a collection and at once raises the question whether it did not originally gain admission to the collection in some other guise. On the other hand, we miss from the collection the very letter Colossians leads us to expect to find there —the letter to Laodicea. The letter so definitely recommended to the Colossians is not likely to have been lost. A tradition of a Laodicean letter certainly lingered in the early church. Marcion applied that name to what we call Ephesians, and the letters to the Seven Churches in the Revelation end with one to Laodicea. If our Philemon went by that name at first, when Ephesians was still an encyclical and without a name of its own, we could understand how it came to find a place in the collection. The problem of the disappearance of the "letter from Laodicea" would be solved, and the list of churches addressed in the original collection would be made up to seven. The presence in it of what now appears as a personal letter would be explained. Then if the Laodicean church lost standing for a while, as the Revelation suggests, and the churches came to be unwilling to keep its name at the head of even the least of Paul's letters, it would naturally take the name of the principal person addressed in it. The suggestion is a bold one, but it seems to satisfy all the elements in the complex situation. It may be added that the spurious Laodiceans found in perhaps a hundred Latin manuscripts, and believed by Harnack to be the Marcionite production re-

ferred to in the Muratorian, is of almost exactly the length of Philemon—about 305 words to 333. As Greek uses more words than Latin, the resemblance in length becomes extraordinarily close; in the Latin Vulgate, the words of Philemon number 322. This coincidence in length may reflect a tradition in some early stichometry that Laodiceans had some fifty *stichoi* and the later Marcionite stop-gap was written to meet the requirement. A Roman stichometry of about 400 A.D., gives Philemon 49 lines; the Clermont List, perhaps a century older, gives it 50.

Marcion was clearly wrong in calling our Ephesians "Laodiceans," but the letters he had in his collection were those of the original one, and his list of church letters was probably right. It is certainly the earliest list of which we know. It ran: Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. But we have seen that his "Laodiceans" was really the introductory encyclical of the original collection, to which he mistakenly applied the name by which Philemon was probably first called. We must remember that the makers of the first collection were interested in church letters, not personal ones. To make an encyclical collection out of mere personal letters would hardly have occurred to anyone. It is altogether probable that the first collection included only letters to churches. Philemon was in it, but probably under some other title. It is also very probable that it contained a letter to the Laodiceans, since our earliest list does so, and the memory of such a title long survived in the an-

cient church. The "letter from Laodicea" is very likely to have accompanied Colossians. It seems very likely therefore that Philemon appeared in the original collection as Laodiceans, thus making the list of churches addressed up to seven and making the list include only letters to churches. Both things are in themselves probable, and both are confirmed by the reflection of the collection in the beginning of the Revelation, where we have a general letter of introduction followed by messages to seven churches, one of them Laodiceans.

If this seems fanciful, it must be remembered that the presence of Philemon in the original collection is very difficult to understand. Philemon was not a leading figure; apart from the letter, nothing is known about him. The letter has little to contribute to doctrine or organization and, as a personal letter, would have no status in the collection of Paul's letters to churches. But if the makers of the collection were very desirous of making their collection up to seven, to suggest Christian unity, they may very well have accepted it as the Laodicean letter commended in Colossians. And if there was no Laodiceans in the first collection, how shall we explain Marcion's inclusion of one in his list?

A dawning prejudice against the Laodicean church is evident in the Revelation's reference to it, and this must have resulted very early in the dropping of its name from the list. But the letter itself could not be dropped, and so it was given the name of the individual first mentioned and chiefly concerned in it, obscure and virtually unheard of though he was.

We may expect to find the vicissitudes of the Pauline collection mirrored in the collections that rose under the shadow of it, and a glimpse of this stage of its development may be seen in the little *corpus* of Johannine letters—encyclical, church letter, and personal letter—which rather confirms the natural presumption that there was a time when Philemon had ceased to be called Laodiceans, but when the introductory encyclical had not begun to be known as Ephesians. It would obviously be much easier to rename Laodiceans "Philemon," in the spirit of Rev. 3: 16, than to give the name of a particular church to the great opening encyclical. But the change of Laodiceans to Philemon reduced the number of churches addressed to six; and fondness for the number seven, with its hint of ideal completeness, must have presently caused a church name to be given to the encyclical. That this change was attended with difficulties is shown by the fact that Marcion calls it Laodiceans and that the introduction of the words "in Ephesus" into the text of the letter came very slowly, as the manuscripts show. To be sure, some of this is conjecture, but the absence of the "letter from Laodicea" and the presence of a personal letter to Philemon in the *corpus* from the beginning are not easy to understand, and both difficulties disappear if we regard Philemon as itself Laodiceans. Certainly the chief, if not the sole, interest of the makers of the collection was in church letters, not private ones.

The order of the original collection is more difficult to determine. Three arrangements are known: that of

Marcion, that of the Muratorian, and that of the oldest manuscripts. What was the original one?

In a recent study of the Pauline letter collection, Harnack has offered the ingenious suggestion that the Corinthian letters actually began the collection, pointing out that they stand first in the Muratorian List, made probably at Rome about 200, and suggesting that the words "with all those anywhere that call on the name of Jesus Christ," in verse 2 of I Corinthians, are an interpolation made when the letters were first published, in the effort to make an encyclical out of the first letter in the list. The words are certainly difficult, and there can be no doubt that the collection needed an encyclical of some kind to introduce it. But is not that need better met by Ephesians, which needs no textual alteration to adapt it to the purpose, but in the true text as preserved in the most ancient manuscripts, proclaims itself just such an encyclical as the situation demands? And if Ephesians was originally an encyclical, it must have formed the introduction to the collection, and therefore have stood first. If the clause in the second verse of I Corinthians is really an interpolation added to give the letter a wider application, it may have been introduced when in the Roman arrangement of the letters the Corinthian letters were transferred to the head of the collection. By that time, of course, Ephesians had in a measure lost its encyclical character and become known as Ephesians, although the words "in Ephesus" had not even yet been introduced into the salutation.

The beautiful threefold benediction at the end of II

Corinthians strongly suggests that the Corinthians once ended the Pauline collection instead of beginning it. It is unlike any strictly Pauline benediction, yet it is one of the finest and most enduring parts of Christian liturgy and may well come from the time when that liturgical feeling was beginning to make itself felt in the canticles of Luke, the snatch of song in Ephesians, and the choruses and antiphonies of the Revelation. The makers of the collection could hardly do less than mark the finis of it with a benediction; we have seen that they began it with an introductory encyclical.

There is therefore not a little to suggest that under the influence of the publication of Acts, with its heroic picture of Paul, the letters of Paul were collected in the circle of Ephesus, what is known to us as Ephesians being written to introduce the several letters to all Christians everywhere; that it naturally stood first, probably without any title of its own; that the collection included letters to seven churches: Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans, Laodiceans (our Philemon), and Corinthians (the order of the Muratorian List, except that it places Corinthians first); that the ill-repute of the Laodicean church (reflected in Rev. 3:16) soon led to the disappearance of its name from what we know as Philemon, and the introductory letter presently came to be known as Ephesians, from the church that had produced the collection, thus maintaining the number of churches addressed at seven. If such an interest seem improbable, we may recall that the Muratorian writer is careful to observe that Paul "like John, writes

to but seven churches by name," and even numbers each church addressed. The publication of the Revelation, with its list of messages to seven churches, beginning with Ephesus and ending with Laodicea, which it so strongly condemned, may have reacted upon the newly published Pauline collection and, in later editions of it, contributed to such changes as these in the letter titles. It is something of a problem how Philemon came to be preserved at all; but if it is the letter alluded to at the close of Colossians, this would be explained; and it has often been remarked that it would be strange for the early churches to lose the one letter Paul himself gave instructions to another church to secure and read. Nor does Paul, in Colossians, call it the letter to the Laodiceans, but simply the "letter from Laodicea."

Harnack and others before him have maintained that the Pastoral letters, while they did not form part of the first collection of Paul's letters, were added to it so early that they were a part of the collection as known to Polycarp (A.D. 107–117). But the resemblances between Polycarp and the Pastorals are hardly strong enough to outweigh the manifestly later atmosphere of the Pastorals; they have rather the sound of proverbial sayings current in the early second century: "Greed is the source of all our ills"; "We bring nothing into this world and we can take nothing out of it." In view of the character and interests of the Pastorals themselves, it seems much more natural to assign them to a later date than Polycarp. And Harnack's view that while they were already added to the Pauline *corpus* as Polycarp knew it, they

were not in the collection as known to Marcion a generation later, has very obvious difficulties. The point made by Harnack is not simply that Marcion did not accept the Pastorals into his Pauline *corpus* but that he did not even know them. It is hard to see how this could have happened, if they were already a part of that *corpus* as known to Polycarp in 107–117.

If the collection of Ignatius' letters in any way reflects the state of the Pauline *corpus* about A.D. 110, the fact that it includes one personal letter, that to Polycarp, may support the view that our Philemon was already recognized as a personal letter by that time—a thing altogether probable also in view of the make-up of the Letters of John. The inclusion of one personal letter in the Ignatian *corpus* may have been influenced by the presence of one in the overshadowing Pauline collection. That the Ignatian letters began with one to the Ephesians probably suggests that by their time the general letter at the beginning of the Pauline collection had begun in some circles to be called Ephesians, for a time, however, retaining its leading position in the list.

Marcion's list, about 140, contained ten letters. Three points about it may be noted. It began with Galatians, doubtless because it was most congenial to Marcion's strong anti-Jewish bias. It contained Ephesians, but called it Laodiceans. It ended with Philemon, which I have suggested may have been the original Laodiceans, but which had already come to be regarded as a personal letter. This made the total of the churches addressed seven, and probably the original seven of the first Paul-

ine collection; only now the introductory encyclical had become Laodiceans, and what had once probably been known as Laodiceans had taken the name of Philemon. We may fairly interpret Marcion's list, therefore, as suggesting that some memory lingered that the Pauline letters had contained none addressed to Ephesus, but included one to Laodicea, though just which one it was had become uncertain. These points, it will be seen, accord very well with the suggestions already advanced as to the original contents of the collection.

The newly formed collection is thus most clearly reflected in the Revelation (encyclical, seven church letters). The Letters of John (encyclical, church letter, personal letter) reflect the earliest alteration of it(encyclical, six church letters, personal letter). The Ignatian letters (Ephesians and other church letters; one personal letter) mirror its next form (Ephesians and other church letters; one personal letter). The uncertainty about this change is reflected in Marcion (seven church letters including our Ephesians as "Laodiceans" but no "Ephesians," and one personal letter).

If these considerations have some color of probability, we may tentatively reconstruct the early history of the Pauline *corpus* as follows:

It was made under the influence of the great picture of Paul and his religious significance for Greek Christianity given in the Acts. As originally constituted, it began with an introductory encyclical, known to us as Ephesians. This was followed by nine letters, addressed to seven churches, including our Philemon under the

name of Laodiceans, and ending with I and II Corinthians. This stage of it is mirrored in the letters to the seven churches at the beginning of the Revelation, itself a limited encyclical to seven churches, introduced by a general letter to all seven.

The unworthiness of the Laodicean church pointed out in the Revelation caused its name to be dropped from the title of Laodiceans, which came to be called Philemon, after the principal man addressed in it, who was really in spite of the address the correspondent most concerned; this is the stage reflected in the Letters of John, which consist of an encyclical, a church letter, and a personal one. But this reduced the number of churches addressed to six, and lost the suggestion of completeness and unity implied in the number seven; and so later, to regain this, the introductory encyclical was called Ephesians, like the first of the Revelation letters, and in allusion to the church which had first collected and published the Pauline *corpus*.

This stage in the history of the collection is reflected in the seven letters of Ignatius, which begin with a letter to the Ephesians and end with a personal letter to Polycarp. This is also the stage of the history that Marcion somewhat indistinctly reflects. With him the memory of a list of seven churches, containing a Laodiceans but no Ephesians, persists, so that in his collection of ten letters of Paul, seven churches are represented, and one individual, Philemon. The title Ephesians has not yet, it is clear, become fixed upon the letter known to us by that name, since Marcion calls it Laodiceans.

Our next glimpse of the history is in the time of Irenaeus, 185 A.D., who accepts the Pastorals with great cordiality, thus making the number of letters up to thirteen, as in the collection of Plato's letters. The Pastorals, to Timothy and Titus, are in form personal, but in fact general letters, to the churches of a whole province or even to all the churches. They therefore reflect both the personal precedent of Philemon, as it was in their day, and the encyclical tone that had come to pervade the whole Pauline collection. Paul's church letters had been made into encyclicals so successfully that they could not imagine his personal letters being anything less. In the Muratorian List of about 200, the Pauline *corpus,* in which, it reminds us, Paul wrote to but seven churches by name, runs as follows: Corinthians (*ad Corinthios prima*), Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans (*ad Romanos septima*); then to individuals: Philemon, Titus, Timothy. Marcionite letters written in the name of Paul to the Laodiceans and the Alexandrians are repudiated. Here again the memory of a Laodicean letter strikes us. Indeed, so strong was it, that such a letter, chiefly made up of tags from Philippians, found its way, as we have seen, into many Latin Bibles, being as Harnack thinks the very Marcionite invention mentioned here in the Muratorian. Beyond this point the history of the Pauline collection is familiar. Hebrews was added to it by the great Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, making the list up to fourteen; III Corinthians appears in some Syriac

canons; and the correspondence with Seneca forms a kind of apocryphal supplement to it in aftertimes.

The Marcionites it seems would have it that there was a letter to the Laodiceans; and that title, having first, as I believe, belonged to Philemon, passed presently with Marcion to what we call Ephesians, and, failing to maintain itself there, at length actually had a little letter written simply to carry it on, so that that Pauline title might not perish from the memory of the church.

Thus the collections of letters that sprang up under the influence of the great Pauline *corpus* reflect its changing form and remind us that it has itself had an interesting literary history. This is not strange if it was, as we have seen, the first group of Christian writings to be formed, the nucleus of early Christian literature, the germ of the New Testament, and the parent and precedent not only of numerous other Christian letter collections but of one collection even greater than itself—the Fourfold Gospel, which remains the supreme literary treasure of Christianity. It is hard for us who are so accustomed to it to realize what an impression it must have made when it first appeared. For it did not leak out letter by letter, but as a collection burst upon the Christian public of its day as though newly written. We cannot too strongly insist that these letters had virtually disappeared from sight and use when the Asian editors assembled and published them. The appearance of the collection was a momentous thing; and just because it played so vital a part in the development of Christianity, its

own history was not stagnant, but it was again and again molded to the life of its times. It acted powerfully upon Christian literary expression from the time of its publication onward; hardly a book of Christian origin for centuries escaped its influence; and naturally enough the literature that sprang up under its shadow reacted upon it in some minor details. Some of those reactions we have sought to trace in this essay. But the influence of contemporary literature upon the Pauline *corpus* was immeasurably less than the influence of the *corpus* itself upon that literature, and it is the purpose of these pages to point out that later New Testament literature can be successfully understoood only as composed in the immediate presence of the first collection of the Letters of Paul.

VI

THE ORIGIN OF ACTS

THE noteworthy studies made in recent years by American scholars in the Acts of the Apostles have raised important questions and reminded us all of the pivotal place of Acts in the history of New Testament literature. In approaching the difficult question of its origin, some general considerations often overlooked ought first to be reviewed.

It has generally been recognized that in the production of any book of the New Testament, as of other literature, two things were necessary—an author and a situation. To these ought to be added a third which may fairly be distinguished from them, namely a public. Sometimes of course the existence of a public is implicit in the existence of the situation, but not always. In any case it will be salutary to keep in view this often neglected factor.

In the first place, the historical significance of these documents becomes vastly greater when this factor is considered. It was much that there was in the first century a Christian teacher capable of writing the Letter to the Romans. But it is not less noteworthy that there was a Christian public at Rome and in other congregations capable of reacting to such a work. Indeed the more one studies Romans the more one comes to feel that the ex-

istence of such a public was perhaps even more remarkable than the existence of such a writer. This would be no more than saying that the church was more significant than its leaders. Certainly it is a massive fact for the historian that there was in the first Christian generation a Christian public capable of reading, understanding, prizing, and preserving such a letter as Romans. And to the modern student not the least value of Paul's letters is the disclosure they make of the Christian communities to which they were addressed.

In the second place, this consideration may safeguard us from conjecturally postulating precarious hypothetical documents for which no probable public can be discerned. To every conjectural document we may apply these tests: Is the author whom it implies a reasonably probable historical figure? Is the situation or occasion which it implies historically probable? And can we reasonably postulate for it a public considerable enough to have taken it up and given it at least a brief life?

The books and documents of the New Testament are in general the parts of primitive Christian literature which found and kept a public. Scores of letters were doubtless written by the same hands, perhaps not inferior in quality to some of these, which have perished, for want of a competent and appreciative public. For the fact is, literature, Christian or other, is a social product in this sense at least, that a work must respond to some taste or need of the readers it reaches or it will fall stillborn. The true writer presents not merely his own views

but in large part at least views and ideas congenial and even common to his readers. Otherwise he will not reach them at all.

With these general considerations in mind let us approach the problem of Acts, and briefly recall the recent studies relating to it.

In 1916 Professor Torrey propounded his theory that I Acts, that is, Acts 1:1—15:35, is translated throughout by the writer of II Acts from an Aramaic document of 49–50 A.D. and that our Acts was written before the death of Paul. Professor Wilson has vigorously sustained him, in two papers in the *Harvard Theological Review*. His theory has been criticized by Professor Foakes-Jackson in the same review, by Professor Bacon in the *American Journal of Theology,* and by Professor Burkitt in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. Professor Torrey has rejoined in the *American Journal of Theology*. Meantime Dr. Cadbury has dealt in a notable way with the "Style and Literary Method of Luke," incidentally putting the supposedly medical color of Luke's language in a new light. More recently the editors of the *Beginnings of Christianity* have accepted the theory in principle, although with considerable modifications.

Professor Torrey has certainly given us fresh and convincing evidence of the Aramaic influences that operated upon Luke in the composition of what he has taught us to call I Acts, that is, 1:1—15:35. He has plainly proved that behind many passages of Acts lie Aramaic forms of expression, which sometimes are of

much value in helping us to determine the ideas of the historian's informants and perhaps even the facts themselves. I would only urge that, as Dr. Burkitt has pointed out, Professor Torrey has in some instances yielded prematurely to the doubts and suspicions that the Greek awakens, and hidden himself in the covert of his Semitic pavilion before it was really necessary to do so. And this conditions the validity of his deductions from the evidence he has amassed. He believes it sufficient to establish the theory that I Acts is as a whole a translation made from an Aramaic document which was written in Palestine late in A.D. 49 or early in 50, and discovered by Luke probably in Rome after he arrived there in A.D. 62. Luke who had already about A.D. 60 written his gospel, translated the work into Greek and became the continuator of it, writing II Acts, that is, 15:36—28:31, about A.D.. 64.

I have examined all the instances of alleged mistranslation upon which this theory chiefly hinges, and with Professor Burkitt, I cannot think that Professor Torrey "has produced a compelling demonstration," or that "his hypothesis of an Aramaic basis makes these passages any easier." Some that Professor Torrey objects to do not seem to me so very difficult, though every ancient text contains difficulties.

I am unable in the first place to feel the sharp transition at 15:36 that this theory implies. Or to speak more broadly, some narratives in I Acts, e.g., 3:19–30, seem to me quite as Greek in diction as some in II Acts. For example the letter of the Jerusalem apostles and presby-

ters to the gentile brethren in Syria and Cilicia, Acts 15:23–29, is in epistolary forms the most perfectly Greek letter in the New Testament. It begins "The apostles . . . . to the brethren . . . . greeting" (χαίρειν), and it ends "Good bye" (ἔρρωσθε). Hundreds of papyrus letters exhibit these forms, but of thirty or thirty-five letters in the New Testament only this one. In a literal translation from the Aramaic, this is strange. It is interesting that the next most Greek example of a letter in the New Testament is in II Acts (23:26–32), which, like James, has the opening salutation χαίρειν. Both of these letters are decidedly Greek in style, but the one in I Acts is the more so.

Nor are the supposedly untranslatable passages in Acts confined to I Acts. One of the very worst is in II. Of 24:18 Moffatt says, "It is hardly possible to make sense of the following Greek text, and none of the various readings or of the emendations that have been proposed is entirely satisfactory." But if the Greek feeling of some parts of I Acts is as good as anything in II Acts, and if some sentences in II Acts are as hopelessly untranslatable as anything in I Acts, the sharp line of division detected by the Aramaic School at 15:35 is badly blurred.

In weighing the arguments of Professor Torrey, one is hampered by the difficulty of finding any Hebrew or Aramaic documents of any sort definitely referable to the first century with which to compare the supposed Hebrew or Aramaic manners of speech in the Gospels and Acts. The fact is there is next to nothing in the way

of contemporary written Semitic materials by which to test the Hebrew or Aramaic documents postulated by Professor Torrey. To a student of Greek, rich in first-century philological materials of all sorts, literary, documentary, and epigraphic, this would seem to put these novel theories at a serious disadvantage at the outset. A few fragmentary apocalypses may with some probability be assigned to the first half of the first century, but even these are mostly known to us through their Greek remains. Looking broadly at early Christian history it would seem that it was the impact of the Christian movement upon Greek life that resulted in the literary precipitate we find in early Christian literature. That Christianity had found literary expression in Aramaic or Hebrew is by no means a matter of course. We should have first to show that Aramaic or Hebrew populations of the time had a bent for literary expression. But it is precisely here that evidence is strikingly meager. Over against the steadily rising tide of Greek literary expression of Christianity, Palestinian Judaism and Christianity are all but mute.

But even if a few scattered apocalypses can with some confidence be referred to the first century, this will not suffice. A further question must be raised with reference to the Palestinian Aramaic-reading population: Had it the habit or instinct for contemporary historical composition?

Two or three centuries later, indeed, the Jews came to commit to writing masses of material long current among them in oral form. But these do not establish a

habit of written historical composition in the first Christian century. Quite the contrary. They show that the Aramaic way at that early time was not to write but to remember. If a Jew wanted to write, he wrote in Greek —Philo, Paul, Josephus. Did they also write in Aramaic? It is not absolutely impossible—Josephus says he wrote the Wars first in his native tongue, for the Babylonian Jews—but if they did so, what they wrote perished unregarded through the fault of their Aramaic public. This is very much the same as saying that there was no substantial Aramaic-reading public for them to address. Just as Paul had to enter the Greek world before he found a public to write to, so had Philo, and so had Josephus. Against the *vera causa* of these three great Jewish writers of Greek literature, I at least am able to muster on the most liberal interpretation of first-century Palestinian Aramaic a scant five or ten pages of extant material. Is this an adequate guaranty of an Aramaic-reading public in Palestine? We may not lightly assume that because there were Aramaic-speaking people living in Judea in the first century and possessed of a meager literature, there must have been an appreciable reading public there. The genius of the Greek world was for books, old and new. It was a reading and writing world. That the Aramaic people of the first century were of the same sort cannot be just taken for granted but calls for massive evidence.

Moreover, as has often been observed, the primitive expectation of the speedy return of Jesus in messianic splendor to usher in the new messianic age was a definite

deterrent to considered literary composition in Christian circles. It was not even worth while to marry, or to be manumitted, or to change one's condition in any respect. The time was short. The Lord was at the doors. This was unquestionably the atmosphere of the first age, that is till A.D. 70 at any rate. Such an atmosphere would not deter men from writing an occasional letter of course, and the literature of this period is prevailingly letters. We should hardly expect it to produce actual books, in the sense of reasoned literary compositions designed to meet a given situation and to circulate among a considerable definite public. Face to face with the Last Judgment, primitive Christians were in no mood to write history. For whom were they to write it?

The fall of Jerusalem in a sense encouraged these apocalyptic hopes and yet at the same time began to put a period to them. Its first effect must have been to quicken and stimulate immediate apocalyptic expectation. Surely now the Messiah would appear! But as time went on and it became clear that even that great catastrophe had not ushered in the end, apocalyptic expectation must have fallen lower than it had ever been since the death of Jesus. In such a situation, with the first glimmering sense that the church might be facing a long future, thoughtful men might naturally think of writing accounts of the great movement in the midst of which they were living. One such man was the author of Acts.

It must be further observed that the existing documents of primitive Christianity give little encourage-

ment to the theory of primitive Christian historical writings, Aramaic or Greek. Paul in I Corinthians gives clear evidence of using an oral compend of Jesus' deeds, sayings, and passion in his missionary work; and Luke in his famous preface reflects the same practice. Occasional sayings of Jesus cited in Acts, I Thessalonians, I Clement, and Polycarp reflect the same custom; at all events they are not found in our gospels and yet evidently stood in some gospel-form then current and familiar. On the other hand there is little evidence from the first century of the use and influence of our written gospels, except for the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke. The meaning of these facts seems to be that the oral compend served the first-century Greek Christians at all events, as a gospel; that the idea of putting it into writing did not present itself for some time, and that even when written gospels did appear, the old familiar oral form long overshadowed them, somewhat as the old Authorized Version still overshadows the Revised Versions. The facts of the first century do not favor the idea of an early craving for written gospels, but rather indicate a general satisfaction with the oral compend attested by Paul and Luke.

It would be strange to find any contemporary Aramaic historical composition from the middle of the first century. It would be doubly strange to find such a work produced in a Christian group, which was living from day to day in lively expectation of the end. Yet within this curious double vacuum the supporters of I Acts have conjured up a whole Christian Semitic literature.

There is the Hebrew original of our Luke, chapters 1 and 2, dealing with the births and early years of John and of Jesus. There is the Aramaic Gospel of Mark. There is the Aramaic original of Luke, chapter 24. There is the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew. There is I Acts. There is even an Aramaic Gospel of John.

If this new literature is to be taken seriously, and definitely built upon in Synoptic and other study, certain questions must be asked and answered. They are the familiar inquiries of introduction. Who wrote I Acts? This does not mean, "What was his name?" That would matter little. The question is, "What were his ideas and his horizons, and what was his circle?" Again, what historical situation called forth the book, and where and when did this situation arise? This should be easily gathered from the book itself, as from most of the documents of the New Testament. A third question remains: "For what public was the book produced?" The answering of these questions will integrate the document in history and put us in a position to deal with it practically. Every newly discovered document has to stand the test of these inquiries. Indeed this is far the more important aspect of Professor Torrey's discoveries. If these documents did indeed exist, they throw the whole primitive history of Christianity into a new perspective because of the several situations and the several publics they imply. Not what they report but what they reflect is of first importance.

Now if I Acts be a Palestinian Aramaic document of the middle of the first century it at once reveals an au-

thor. He has traced the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Antioch and Cyprus and Galatia, with especial interest in its groping its way gradually out of Jewish groups, first among proselytes and devout persons, then into Samaritan communities, then into Greek. Although writing in the midst of the primitive movement he has reversed the course of events and read back the Christian missionary program into the very beginnings of the church. He is interested in the rise of the Greek mission even before it has become a considerable and successful movement. Not only is he interested, but he has become the historian of the infant project. It is like writing the biography of a not very promising child before it has grown up. But the difficulty of understanding the attitude of the author of the work is less than that of understanding the occasion of his work, and still less than that of visualizing the public for which he produced it.

The greatest thing about a book is not its execution but its conception. The greatest thing about Acts is its idea. The thought of sketching the rise of the Greek Mission was an inspiration. In a time when that mission was a splendid and flourishing reality, such an inspiration is conceivable. In a time when it was still a feeble and dubious experiment viewed askance by most of the brotherhood, some of them zealous enough to follow up its founders and seek to undo their work, I find it quite incomprehensible. In the 80's such an inspiration is natural. In the 40's it is an anachronism. But the difficulty of believing in I Acts is greatest when we seek an appro-

priate public for it. To the Greek churches of the west in the last quarter of the first century such a book as Acts would have been of the greatest interest and inspiration. It was the story of their own beginnings, and integrated them honorably in the heroic period of the new religion. It was like the Greek mind to want such a work, and like the Greek mind to conceive it, and like the Greek mind again to welcome and preserve it. These were the very churches that produced in this very generation the Revelation of John, and the Gospel of Luke, and in the next the Pauline *corpus,* the Gospel of John, and the Fourfold Gospel collection, and that called forth the letters of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Can this extraordinary thirst for Christian literature be matched anywhere else at that or any earlier period? For such a public Acts had to be written. In such an atmosphere it is perfectly natural and appropriate. There were men in plenty to read it and to prize it, and there would be a man to write it. That the Greek Christian reading public about the Aegean at the turn of the century could produce its own writers most of the New Testament is evidence.

Turn back now to the middle of the century and to the Aramaic brethren of Judea. What need had a Jewish messianic sect for a Christian literature? It already had a valued messianic literature in the Hebrew Old Testament. What evidence have we of any thirst on their part for new books? What writers did they produce? What written collections did they assemble and circulate? Above all what interest would attach for them

to the story of the precarious introduction of the gospel among humble little circles in obscure settlements of the interior of Asia Minor—all that I Acts contains—and at the expense of the very things that they themselves prized most, their Jewish separatism and privilege? Such a story would mean little enough to us, without the brilliant sequel. It does not arrive. It would mean far less to them, besides being vastly less congenial.

That there should have been a Palestinian Christian Aramaic-reading public about A.D. 50 interested to read how the gospel was already feeling its way past them into the Greek world seems very near the height of improbability. Certainly it would require most cogent proof to establish the rise of such a document in such a circle at such a time.

Professor Torrey has well said in his essay on *Original Aramaic Gospels,* p. 274, in speaking of Hebraisms: "It is only when the idiom is one link in a long chain that it becomes convincing; then indeed it may have an absolutely compelling force. The argument is cumulative; we are concerned with the continuous impression made by a great mass of material, rather than with a number of striking instances—though these are to be had in abundance when they are sought for." Now in his discussion of I Acts, Professor Torrey has exhibited a number of striking instances. But these of course really prove nothing, since by the conditions of the situation practically all the speakers and ultimate sources of the historian's information spoke Semitic. This has generally been understood. But to establish I Acts as an Ara-

maic document these striking instances do not suffice. For that, we desiderate precisely that "continuous impression made by a great mass of material" of which Professor Torrey has spoken. And as one reads I Acts in Greek, paragraph by paragraph, steadily savoring its literary quality, it is just that continuous impression that it fails to give. One finds himself now in the familiar Semitic atmosphere, now in a realm slightly Semitic, now in the purest and most unadulterated Koine of Epictetus and the papyri. If Luke is all the time faithfully translating from an Aramaic source this is inexplicable.

Moreover the whole feeling of the narrative changes again and again. You can feel that the historian has finished with what his immediate source, whether oral or written, has given him and is filling in the narrative from such information as he can get, until he can take up another account and follow it through. The middle part of chapter 9 is a good example of this (vss. 19–30). My own impression of the material of I Acts is that, so far from suggesting derivation from a single source through a single translator, it is strikingly varied in both matter and manner. Now it is more Semitic, now less so, now very Greek. Now it is full and repetitious, now concise and summary. Now it is richly legendary, now coolly matter of fact. Now it is full of Septuagint reminiscence, now it is wholly free from it for pages at a time. All this speaks for a variety of probably oral sources, most of them of course ultimately Semitic, and I should suppose probably Aramaic, but probably all of them unwritten.

The Semites have been great story-tellers; not, I

think, great historians. There are the stories of Genesis and Samuel and Kings and the Arabian Nights, of Jonah, Daniel, Tobit, and Ahikar. Jesus himself was a teller of stories, as not a few parables attest. To that illustrious line belong, I believe, the stories of I Acts. No Greek could have produced them. But who but a Greek could have made such amazing use of them? To conceive the rise of a movement and trace it patiently, and on the whole fairly objectively, through a long series of apparently detached incidents till at the end what one has been driving at all along at length stands clear—the insight and restraint and historical scent of this proceeding seem to me only Greek. To credit it to an Aramaic Jew is to confound the specific geniuses of the two races.

That Luke should sometimes retain a half Semitic diction is not in the least strange when we recall that for years he must have read the Septuagint and heard it read in church. Professor Burkitt finds some of the alleged Aramaisms in Acts better Septuagint than Aramaic, and the late Professor Moulton in the second volume of his *Grammar,* concludes (p. 21) that Luke knew no Aramaic:

> Had he been his own translator, we should have expected to find the same evenness in the distribution of Aramaisms as we find in those general features of grammar and style which so overwhelmingly vindicate the unity of the two books *Ad Theophilum.*

The ingenious argument of Professor Torrey as to the impossibility of composing in what he describes as translation Greek goes rather too far. The imitation of biblical diction is one of the commonest of literary phe-

nomena. Most old-fashioned prayers were of that description. Many English hymns exhibit the same quality. Much alleged undergraduate humor takes that form. The chief modern example is the Book of Mormon, which none of us I suppose acknowledges as a translation at all. The biblical style of John Bunyan cited by Moulton (*Grammar,* II, 8), is a happier illustration. And generally speaking it is the people who are least acquainted with Semitic languages who are most fascinated with composing in this half-Semitic English.

On the other hand, the maintenance of a unified style and literary atmosphere throughout an extended work like Acts, dealing with widely different scenes and circles and based upon diverse sources of information, is very difficult; indeed it is one of the severest tests of literary skill. But probably all will agree that Luke is not greatly concerned for literary form. He is interested in presenting a certain historical movement and setting it in a certain light. The literary form in which he does this is of no such moment to him as it would have been to a seasoned Greek man of letters. It does not matter to him that on one page he is reproducing the half-Semitic style in which he had heard a story told, and to which long acquaintance with the Septuagint had accustomed him; while on another he is following the easy Greek diction of another informant, and on a third is freely composing from facts he had himself observed.

To sum up: I can find for comparison no such body of written contemporary Palestinian Aramaic material as the I Acts theory implies. One is further disturbed by

the general Aramaic indisposition to literary composition at the time in question, which is well nigh absolute, and is doubly striking in contrast with contemporary Greek volubility. A step farther, we are dismayed to perceive how unfavorable all this is to the writing up of immediately contemporary events in historical form. The improbability is heightened by the character of the events described which are hardly such as we should expect a Judean disciple to rejoice in, least of all in Aramaic. Putting aside these misgivings, however, and assuming author, medium, and idea, what is the occasion of the composition of I Acts? Fronting with all the saints of his day the immediate return of the Messiah, what pressing situation leads its writer to literary composition? But the most difficult question of all remains. For what public was it composed? What Palestinian circle of Aramaic readers reacted to this up-to-date pro-Gentile historical sketch, and scattered copies of it as far as Rome?

It is not the diction, it is the substance of Acts that is most fatal to Professor Torrey's theory of its origin. Let us assume that the theory is true. Suppose for a moment that I Acts was really written in Aramaic, in Palestine about A.D. 50, and first seen by Luke in Rome about 62, two years after he had written his Gospel. How delighted Luke must have been to discover it! Here was a work he might easily have written himself. We can imagine his surprise and gratification as he observed its writer's agreement with him about many matters large and small. Although written in different countries and by different hands and without any acquaint-

ance on the part of either writer with the other's work, they exhibit an array of agreements in ideas and attitude, and also in detailed representations of fact, that is simply staggering, the more especially as, in almost every case, these two works stand in these particulars quite apart from any earlier or contemporary works of Christian literature that have come down to us. Let us review some of these points and try to imagine how these resemblances must have affected Luke as he unrolled the Aramaic I Acts, column after column, and beheld its amazing resemblances to his own Gospel, published quite independently two years before.

Both speak of Pilate as Pontius Pilate.

Both put Herod and Pilate together.

Both connect Herod with the trial of Jesus.

Both call Annas high-priest.

Both are firm believers in punitive miracles.

Both give prominence to angels, and not simply in dreams.

Both have much to say of women.

Both invest spiritual events with physical phenomena.

Both are fond of poetical quotations.

Both emphasize the apostles much more than do Matthew, Mark, or John.

Both give a list of apostles unlike that of Matthew or Mark.

Both elaborate the resurrection appearances.

Both have a strong doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Both describe their leading figures as equipped for their work by a descent of the Holy Spirit upon them.

Both speak of being filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke, three times; Acts, five).

Both use this verb figuratively of being "filled with" anger, fear, madness, amazement, jealousy. No other New Testament writer does this.

I Acts began just where Luke's gospel was so soon to leave off.

Both name several individuals of whom there is very little to be said (Susanna, Joanna, Rhoda, John of Acts 4:6, Alexander, Prochorus, Nicanor, Symeon, Lucius, and others).

Both are deeply interested in the poor.

Both speak of the Book of Psalms. No other New Testament writer mentions the Psalms.

In both, a Roman captain sends a delegation for help.

In both, the sick are brought in great numbers to be cured.

Both feel an interest in the Samaritans that is unknown to Matthew and Mark.

Both show conscious parallels to incidents in the Pentateuch: the seventy-two missionaries; the Confusion of Tongues undone at Pentecost.

Both narratives open in Jerusalem. No other New Testament book does this.

Both lay some of their opening scenes in the Temple.

Both describe Jesus after the Resurrection as eating with the disciples.

Both describe Jesus as instructing the disciples to wait in Jerusalem for what the Father had promised.

Both place the parting scene east of the city, toward Bethany.

Both associate Peter and John.

Both speak of a forty-day experience of Jesus.

Both describe an important matter early in the story as settled by lot.

Both relate how the apostles sought to call down destruction upon those whose behavior they disapproved.

Both declare that the Twelve are to be witnesses.

In both, the key to the new movement is found in a passage from the Hebrew prophets, which serves as text or frontispiece.

Surely, the bearing of these thirty-five particulars is obvious, and it is not in the direction taken by Professor Torrey and his supporters.

There are two ways of viewing a document, as there are of viewing a manuscript. One may look at the details of a handwriting or one may hold a page at arm's length and look at the general effect of the whole. If one looks at the general characteristics of Acts, as we have it, it seems at once to suggest a time when the Greek mission is triumphant and Greek Christians are sufficiently mature to feel an interest in the story of the movement in the high tide of which they are living. Harnack's appreciation of the aim and occasion of Acts as set forth in the introduction to his *Acts of the Apostles* seems to me altogether convincing, in spite of the fact that he is himself, I suppose, no longer convinced by

it. Its purpose may fairly be described as historical, but of course it is history with a purpose. That purpose is to inform Greek Christians as to how the Gospel groped its way from Jerusalem out into the Greek world until it was established in the central cities of the empire; and further to confirm their faith by showing the providential and even supernatural guidance that had followed the movement all the way. It forms part of a larger work of which the Gospel of Luke is the first volume, and like that book it presents early in its course a frontispiece, 2: 1 ff., which foreshadows the story it is to tell. "The plan of his double work," says Professor Scott, "—for the Gospel and the Acts must be taken together—is a truly magnificent one. He sets himself to show how the message destined for all mankind found its way to all, diffusing itself in ever widening circles over the whole world" (*Beginnings of the Church,* p. 23). To look at Luke as a work completed before Acts was thought of, is to lose sight of the incompleteness of Luke in the matter of the Holy Spirit, which is promised indeed in Luke but is not bestowed until early in Acts.

Of its public I have spoken above. Its date rests upon a series of considerations. The infancy, miracle, and resurrection attitudes are markedly later and more extreme than those of Matthew, and sometimes decidedly verge toward those of the infancy gospels of the second century. The writer's idea of speaking with tongues is the late (linguistic) one of the Long Conclusion of Mark; not the early (ecstatic) one of the Pauline time. The writer is sufficiently removed from the primitive

community to be able to read back into its time the missionary program. He writes at a time when the twelve apostles have come to be recognized as the authorities of the church, and when a post-Pauline polity is already at least measurably established. The sects are beginning to appear for they come in for the same vague invective that is employed in the Pastorals.

But the most significant feature of Acts in this connection is its reflection of the fate of Paul. As Professor Bacon admirably puts it,

> As to Paul the reader is not really left in ignorance. His fate is made known, but made known with that chaste reticence which the Greek poets employ when they only report through others the tragedies enacted behind the scenes. In the great farewell discourse of Acts 20:17–38 the martyr takes his leave. In Acts 28:17–31 the tragedy is veiled behind the triumph of the cause.[1]

That our Acts was produced before the death of Paul is quite out of the question in view of the farewell journey of chapters 20 and 21. The universal tendency of the human mind to dwell upon foreboding, presentiment, and apprehension after the fact, is daily illustrated, and has in the late war been exemplified on an unparalleled scale. Almost everybody we know who lost his life, is now said to have had and expressed a presentiment of his fate. Of course thousands of those who survived had them too; but their presentiments are forgotten. Paul uttered many discourses on his last journey to Jerusalem; one of them lasted all night long, and if fully

[1] "More Philological Criticism of Acts," *American Journal of Theology*, XXII, 15.

reported would have filled the whole book of Acts. It is not reported at all. All that is reported from Paul's utterances and conversations on this journey has to do with his approaching death, for which he is seeking to prepare his friends. But if he is still alive when Acts is published all these gratuitous presentiments become mere weakness. Paul might indeed have said such things among a thousand others; but why should the historian have singled them out for record? Of course because they have been fulfilled. But I should go farther than this. The death of Paul as I read the Acts is not even recent. It is long past, and Paul has become a hallowed memory, so that his last will and testament to the Ephesian elders—was Acts then written under the shadow of Ephesus?—is freighted with the authority of one whose greatness has been vindicated by the passing years. His figure has grown to heroic proportions, while his fellow-workers have dwindled to mere background. All this brings us to the late 80's or early 90's.

For the *terminus ad quem* I should look to the collision of the church with the empire over emperor-worship about the close of Domitian's reign, reflected in the Revelation of John, I Peter, Hebrews, and I Clement, and in retrospect at least in the Pliny-Trajan correspondence. The atmosphere of Acts is not clouded, as these documents are, with contemporary persecution. It rather emphasizes the generally tolerant and even favorable attitude of the Roman authority. This would be most natural toward the close of that generation of comparative quiet which the churches enjoyed between the

short, sharp attack of Nero in 64 and that of Domitian thirty years later.

Professor Foakes-Jackson is no doubt right in saying that it is impossible to say with any degree of positiveness that Luke, the companion of Paul, was the final redactor of Acts, and that Acts as we have it comes from a Pauline source. Yet it does seem to me decidedly probable that it comes from a Pauline source, for the Greek churches about the Aegean still considered themselves Pauline at the beginning of the second century, and the writer who drew the heroic figure of Paul in Acts had a notable appreciation of some aspects at least of Paul. I am not sure that Paul himself fully realized all the implications for Jewish believers of his doctrine of freedom from the law; it is just possible he himself would not measure up to our ideas of a thoroughgoing Paulinist. Our criticism is leaning over backward when it balks at the plain clue of the We-narratives, as though the authorship of Acts were a crime and the writer must constantly be suspected of throwing us off the scent.

Have the advocates of the We-diary document really established for the ancients the practice of keeping diaries? If they have, who else among Paul's companions is likely to have been enough of a literary man to keep one? What probability is there that such an essentially private document would find its way into the hands of a later historian? And what likelihood that in using it he would fail not once but more than seventy times to conform its verb forms and personal pronouns to his con-

text? The changes of person in Ezra-Nehemiah are hardly a parallel to this. And he is no stranger to us, it must be remembered; we have seen him using the Gospel of Mark and know his careful way of handling his materials. No one of its friends, in fact, has as yet taken the We-document theory seriously enough to envisage and meet all the difficulties that it involves.

Xenophon's well-known log of marches, so many stages, so many parasangs, can hardly be appealed to. That is an instance of a literary man taking his inevitable notes for his own possible use afterward rather than evidence that the non-literary ancient kept a journal. It constitutes in fact an earlier illustration of what the believer in the Lucan authorship supposes to have happened in the case of Acts. The kind of man that wrote the Anabasis would be likely to take notes along the way, and so would the kind of man that wrote Acts. To think it more probable that some non-literary ancient took notes of his travels for some literary ancient later to happen upon and use is carrying the doctrine of *Sic vos non vobis* too far.

In short, I can see no more probable solution for the intricate problem of the authorship of Acts than the traditional one, that the writer was Luke the companion of Paul. The prefaces of Luke and Acts make it probable that these books were not anonymously put forth as Mark and Matthew seem to have been. Mark and Matthew were rather Semitically conceived, as community products, as it were; Luke and Acts are more individual-

ly introduced, in the Greek manner. We have therefore a right to expect more from tradition in the case of Luke-Acts than in the case of Matthew or Mark.

One is indeed confronted with one very real difficulty as one strives to define a view upon the origin of Acts. If the idea came to Luke only in the time of Domitian, when the Greek mission was in full career, how does he come to possess all this wealth of primitive materials, so full of antique color? The difficulty is a serious one. But two considerations somewhat relieve it. First, this wealth of material proves upon examination to be no very great matter after all. It is striking, rather than voluminous. A thoughtful man could have carried all of it and more in memory for a generation. This would be doubly easy if Luke had used it often in his preaching.

But this is not enough. The stylistic varieties within I Acts (which seem to me just as considerable as those within Acts as a whole) are too great to be thus explained. They suggest to me that while in Palestine the writer had from time to time heard stories, of Aramaic origin of course, and had noted them down much as he heard them. Could he have done this without having as yet planned his two-volume work? Most assuredly he could. The author of Luke-Acts is the most considerable writer in the New Testament, and of them all he may most safely be credited with literary habits somewhat like our own. Does no one nowadays collect literary or historical materials without knowing all the uses he may within thirty years have occasion to put them to? Luke may have gathered much more than he used in

Acts, or in Luke-Acts. He may well have gathered it, or at least jotted it down, simply for his own enjoyment and satisfaction. He may have seen its great religious usefulness, and used it year after year in preaching in the west; more than one of us I am sure has noted a thing down or copied it out of some fugitive sheet, for its sheer interest, and later made telling use of it in ways he never dreamed of at the beginning. If you come upon a saying of a great thinker, and have no paper, said one of the Greeks, write it upon your garments. The Jew would have committed it to memory. The Greek made a note of it.

There is really nothing improbable in the noting down of these stories by a Greek visitor to Palestine, without any immediate historical design in mind. It was in just this way that Greek narrative prose began. The Greek traveler and observer, visiting foreign lands—Lydia, Babylonia, Egypt—published on his return an account of what he had seen and heard—a book of travels, which aroused a wondering interest among the untraveled Greeks at home. The accounts and stories—*logoi*—of these logographers made the eastern world known to the Greeks, and presently one such writer, Herodotus, told his travel-stories so well, and organized them so effectively, that his work was the beginning of history.

The analogies of this great movement in Greek literature with the writing of Acts are perfectly obvious. There is no more natural way to explain the origin of Acts and of the characteristic features of Luke as well.

Is it not plain that it would be precisely the Greek from outside the oriental world that would perceive the interest and worth of just this Palestinian material? It was not the Persian or the Egyptian that wrote up the oriental stories preserved in Hecataeus and Herodotus; it was the Greek visitor to Persia and Egypt.

The parallel with Luke is complete. To a non-Palestinian Christian coming at length into the land and the circle of which he had heard so much, the value of such primitive oral material would be manifest, as it would not be to those who lived in the midst of it. In the Christian circles of Palestine everybody knew it; in the Christian circles of the West, nobody knew it. It would take a man from the outer world to see the worth of all this miscellany of wonder stories; just as it takes a man from the outside to feel the value of the ballads of the Kentucky mountaineers, or of the legends of the Ojibwas.

By these considerations I am encouraged to conclude that there is no improbability in Luke's having collected much literary material on his visits to Palestine, and long years afterward, when the Greek mission was in full swing, conceiving the idea of using some of it in the composition of Acts. This would be like the diarist of the We-sections. It would explain the patchwork character which I feel so strongly in I Acts. It would explain why one episode is very Aramaic in tone, and another very Greek: they come from different informants with different degrees of Greek culture; and why the historian has himself now and then to take the laboring oar and write a paragraph of summary and transition. The won-

der stories of the early part of Acts, I should therefore credit to various Aramaic-speaking circles of Palestine. The man who felt their extraordinary interest enough to note them down came from outside Palestine, and years after when the success of the Greek mission had shown the full significance of its obscure beginnings, used some of them, together with his own memoranda and recollections, in producing what we know as the Book of Acts.

VII

THE DATE OF ACTS

THE early date proposed for Acts by Professor Harnack in 1911 and since then accepted by various scholars, British, German, and American, carries with it important consequences for early Christian literature. It is Professor Harnack's view, it will be remembered, that Acts was written in the lifetime of Paul, presumably during the Roman imprisonment, in the midst of which the narrative breaks off. Since Luke preceded Acts, and Mark preceded Luke, this finding gives new dates to an important series of Christian documents.

If we take up a book on the great war, it is not difficult to determine from its general attitude whether it was produced before or after the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918. It would not be necessary for the writer to relate the signing of it, to disclose this. His point of view would inevitably be so affected by that event that it would throw his work into quite a different perspective. And this should be true of Acts. If Paul has suffered martyrdom when Luke writes, the knowledge of that fact must inevitably color what Luke reports about him and condition the attitude he assumes toward him. It is a suggestive fact that Xenophon in his *Memorabilia of Socrates* nowhere relates the death

of Socrates; the narrative ceases with Socrates still alive and conversing with his friends. But the work explicitly refers to his condemnation and death. In this of course it goes beyond what Acts says of Paul. But Acts is not the memorabilia of Paul but the story of the rise and progress of the Greek mission; and the lesson of the *Memorabilia* is that we must not too readily assume that an ancient hero-narrative, if written after its hero's death, must necessarily report it. Moreover Paul is by no means the hero of Acts in the sense in which Socrates is of the *Memorabilia*.

If the subject of Acts is the rise and progress of the Greek mission, it has reached in Paul at Rome a climax beyond which it could not go. No one can think that an account of Paul's evangelization of Iliberris or some other Iberian town would have rendered Acts any more complete. Similarly an account of Paul's death would have made the book end in anticlimax and have blunted its point, through confusing its aim. Acts is at least in intention history, not biography; and to judge it by its conformity with what we think are the rules of biography will always lead to very precarious results.

We may not, then, conclude from the failure of Luke to relate the death of Paul that Paul was still alive when Luke wrote, for Acts is not the memorabilia of Paul; nor, if it were, need it have contained an account of his death. But we may assume that if Paul was dead when Luke wrote, and Luke knew the fact, it would certainly have colored his account of Paul, even though he did not explicitly report it. It is difficult to see how Luke

could have helped reflecting knowledge of it. What he chose to report of Paul's utterances and relationships ought to reveal at least whether Paul was dead or alive when Acts was written. Especially if, as tradition says, Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome, at the end of a period of imprisonment, Acts, if written after it, cannot but reflect it. We have no right to expect from Acts direct testimony as to Paul's fate, but indirect testimony we have every right to expect. We must therefore interrogate Acts as to its indirect testimony to the fate of Paul.

Thus interrogated, Acts is anything but silent. All the way from Macedonia to Caesarea, Paul's journey is beset with warning, foreboding, and farewell. At Troas Paul talks with his Christian friends from evening until dawn. At Miletus he makes to the Ephesian elders a farewell address which probably sums up what Luke considered the substance of all the farewells of this farewell journey. Paul declares in a tone of unmistakable foreboding that he does not know what fate awaits him in Jerusalem but that he must go there; that in every city he visits on his way the Spirit warns him that prison and persecution await him; but he sets no value on his life, provided he can accomplish his course and perform his service to Christ. And he solemnly adds, "I know that none of you will ever see me again." He knows too that after he is gone, fierce wolves will get in among them and worry the flock, and schismatic teachers will rise among the brethren themselves. At the close of this touching farewell discourse the Ephesians wept, not so

much at the immediate parting, says Luke, as at Paul's ominous declaration (which Luke is careful to repeat) that they would never see him again.

We are not here concerned with why Paul uttered these words, or even with whether he uttered them at all, but solely with the question why Luke reported them. If we have lost a friend in the war, any words of foreboding which he may have uttered before going or after reaching France become at once precious and memorable. If he has returned in safety, or if he is still abroad but unharmed, we say nothing about them and they are soon forgotten. It is precisely the fate of Paul which gives this farewell to the Ephesians all its point and propriety. If Paul is still alive and well when chapter 20 was written, this gloomy forecast becomes gratuitous and ineffectual. Its value even for us virtually hinges upon our consciousness of the martyrdom of Paul. And if the earliest readers of Acts were not aware of the death of Paul, all this pathos must have been quite beside the mark. For if Paul were alive and well when Acts was written, even if he were in prison, what could Luke's reporting his sorrowful words to the Ephesians that they would never see him again, mean? Only that he had definitely determined not to return to them, which would have no very edifying sense for Luke's readers. But if Paul had in fact died without ever having seen these elders again, then Luke's report of such a farewell address to them becomes natural and moving. What we have to consider is, why out of all the things Paul said or might have said on this journey, Luke chose an utterance of

just this kind to report. There can be but one answer. He chose it because subsequent events had made such an utterance of Paul's extremely significant and touching. Mere imprisonment would not have done this unless it were an imprisonment that ended only with his death; and that brings us to the same conclusion by a slightly different way. In short, Luke's inclusion in Acts of this farewell to the Ephesians, especially in the emphatic and detailed way in which he gives it, can only mean that Paul is no longer alive.

The other elements in the address confirm this very strongly. Paul's personal uncertainty and apprehension, his resignation, and especially his prediction that schismatic and heretical teachers would arise to trouble the church (or the churches), all have a decidedly posthumous tone. We can hardly push the beginnings of the rise of the sects as far back as Paul's imprisonment; that is the unmistakable atmosphere of the last years of the first century at the earliest. This prediction is a conspicuous example of the reading back of contemporary conditions into an earlier time of which one is writing, and in its way it is quite as strong a hint that Luke is writing long after Paul's death as is the tragic note in Paul's farewell. The vagueness of the polemic reminds us of the atmosphere of the Pastorals and some of the later Catholic epistles.

This heavy atmosphere of apprehension pervades the further narrative of Paul's journey. Out of a week's conversations at Troas, Luke only reports that the disciples told Paul by the Spirit not to set foot in Jerusalem.

The solemn and tearful farewells continue (Acts 21:5, 13; cf. 20:37, 38). At Caesarea, Agabus again warns Paul against entering Jerusalem, and Paul declares his readiness not only to be imprisoned but to die at Jerusalem. The warning at Caesarea that the Jews will deliver Paul up to the Gentiles recalls the words in which Jesus forecasts his own fate (Luke 18:32), and the resignation of Paul's friends finds expression in words almost identical with those of Jesus in Gethsemane: "The Lord's will be done."

It would take more than an indefinite imprisonment from which Paul might at any time be released to satisfy Luke's emphasis of these forebodings. It is not to Paul's imprisonment but to his death that Paul's friends are made to resign themselves in the journey to Jerusalem. And if these forebodings had turned out to be groundless, Luke would not have recorded them. It is clearly because they have turned out to be only too well grounded that he selects them for detailed and repeated emphasis.

Without spoiling the end of his book, Luke thus skilfully conveys what most of us would have used much clumsier means to communicate. When Acts is written Paul has long been dead. Paul is a heroic, towering figure in Acts. Other men, even the kings and governors before whom he appeared, seem small beside him. In the same way in the first part of the book Peter stands head and shoulders above the men about him. But this pre-eminence of Peter and Paul among their contemporaries was not immediately apparent. It constitutes a

most significant and important evidence of the date of Acts, for it must have taken years for these differences to make themselves felt. It is in the highest degree unhistorical to suppose that they were immediately evident to Paul's companions. This effect, which every reader of Acts feels, is the clearest proof that close to a generation has passed between the scenes recorded in Acts and the writing of the book. Few men indeed are heroes to their contemporaries. Men rise into such stature only in the perspective of years. Who are the heroic figures of today? We can tell better thirty years hence.

Many other considerations unite with these to show that Luke and Acts were written well toward the close of the first century, and probably not far from A.D. 90. We may mention:

1. The literary form of the book—a carefully planned and considered historical work, in two volumes, with a preface, and professedly based upon sources, written and oral. The conception and execution of such a work in the first Christian generation, when the return of Jesus on the clouds was constantly expected, is most improbable. Its marked historical interest and literary technique clearly belong to an age of Christian self-consciousness and reflection. Seen as a literary whole, the work at once suggests an origin in the second generation of Christian literature.

2. The infancy interest, carried back beyond the birth of Jesus and the earlier announcement of it, to the birth of his forerunner John and the announcement pre-

ceding it. In this we are well on the way to the further pushing back of beginnings to the circumstances attending the birth of Mary herself, which we find in the second-century Gospel of James.

3. The extension and elaboration of the resurrection interest, at the other end of the gospel story. This is in marked contrast to the more primitive accounts of it in the Gospel of Matthew, and probably in the lost conclusion of the Gospel of Mark.

4. The developed doctrine of the Holy Spirit, with which the whole narrative of Luke and Acts is suffused. From the influences that guided and inspired Mary and Elizabeth to those that controlled Paul and his fellow-missionaries in their movements, everything is explained by the Holy Spirit.

5. The appearance of punitive miracle. At the very outset, Zachariah is smitten with dumbness for his unbelief. The apostles wish fire called down from heaven upon those who refuse them hospitality. They strike men, and even women, dead or blind. This is reminiscent of the Elijah and Elisha cycles in the Books of Kings, but it is a new development in Christian literature, and with it we are unmistakably on our way to the punitive wonders of the infancy gospels of the second century. It is no explanation of this striking and even shocking feature of Luke and Acts to say that these things simply happened. A thousand other things also happened which these books do not record. They record what they do because these particular matters appealed to the mind

of the author, and seemed to him edifying as compared with much else that he or his informants might have preserved.

6. The softening of the old controversy between Judaiser and Hellenizer in the primitive Greek mission. Such a thing is almost inconceivable if these books are contemporary with that controversy, and has led some to fantastic explanations, as that the writer did not really know Paul's position, or that he was guilty of misrepresenting it. The natural explanation is that, writing for the practical needs of a generation later, when that controversy no longer had present interest, the author would inevitably soften its harshness, and tend to harmonize parties which it was now apparent had both been working, from different points of view, for the same great cause. The greatness of the cause overshadows and obscures the old bitterness, and in the long perspective of a generation crowded with Christian progress the sharp lines of old misunderstandings are lost sight of. This means simply that the author is writing not a controversial pamphlet for Paul's day, nor a historical treatise for our day, but a practical work for his own day, when the need of unity and harmony was coming to be keenly felt.

7. The beginnings of Christian psalmody, in the canticles of Luke—the *Magnificat,* the *Benedictus,* the *Gloria in excelsis,* the *Nunc Dimittis.* This dawning liturgical interest is carried on in the arias and choruses of the Revelation, written shortly after Luke-Acts.

8. The developed church organization reflected in

the appointment of elders in every church, in the emphasis upon baptism, and in the conception of the central authority of the apostles at Jerusalem in the early days.

9. The strangely developed attitude toward the Jewish scriptures, many episodes of which the writer conceives as not so much fulfilled in the Christian movement as positively reversed in it. Thus the Confusion of Tongues at Babel is reversed and remedied in the Gift of Tongues at Pentecost. Babel made men misunderstand one another; Pentecost made them understand. There are several instances of this in Luke-Acts. This is, of course, quite in line with Paul's thought that the sin and fall of Adam were reversed and remedied by the uprightness and sacrifice of Christ, but the idea is carried out and widely extended in Acts.

10. The Speaking with Tongues is not thought of, as in Paul's day, as merely unintelligible ecstatic utterance, but is now glorified into a miraculous linguistic endowment, by virtue of the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is obviously much nearer to the Speaking with New Tongues, of the Long Conclusion of Mark (early second century) than to the primitive Pauline picture of what went on at Corinth.

Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that wherever you sound Luke-Acts for evidence as to its date, the result points you to the same conclusion—a date well toward the close of the first century. When Luke-Acts is written, Paul is a hallowed memory, and already the sects are beginning to appear.

VIII

THE VOCABULARY OF LUKE AND ACTS

IT WOULD seem as though almost every possible experiment and investigation as to the relations between Acts and the Gospel of Luke must have been made, but the statistics of Lucan vocabulary seem never to have been minutely and comprehensively dealt with. Such aspects of New Testament vocabulary have not indeed been wholly neglected, although not all that has been claimed in this direction has actually been accomplished. Nestle in his *Introduction* (Edie's translation [1901], p. 48), says, "Graux has counted not only the words but the letters in the various books." But the references Nestle gives in support of this statement (*Revue de Philologie,* ii, and Zahn, *Geschichte,* i, 76) do not even suggest that Graux counted the words, and show that his count of letters laid no claim to precision: *comptons, avec une approximation suffisante, le nombre des lettres* (p. 98); *Évangile selon St. Mathieu calculé à 89,925 lettres* (p. 118); and similarly of the other books of the New Testament. Nestle's remark would seem to be doubly misleading, and I do not find it repeated in Von Dobschuetz' recent revision of his work (1923).

Mr. A. E. Knoch, the editor of the *Concordant Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (Los Angeles, 1926), by his

ingenious plan of printing just twenty Greek letters to a line, or a thousand to a page, has made it easy to count the letters in the several books of the New Testament, at least in his text of it, which he has based on the three leading uncials. Mr. Knoch's figures begin with 90,816 for Matthew—rather more than Graux's estimate—and result, he kindly informs me, in a total of 689,900. It may be remarked that Mr. Knoch omits the Story of the Adulterous Woman (John 7: 53—8: 11) but includes the Long Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark. The statistic is of course at best a mere curiosity of information; but should anyone desire its details, he can find them in Mr. Knoch's edition.

Nestle's reference to the statistics given in Schaff's *Companion* (pp. 57, 176) is also open to criticism, for Professor Schaff does not claim to have counted the number of words in the Synoptic Gospels, but only to have estimated them. A more accurate statement on the matter is found in M. W. Adams' monograph on *St. Paul's Vocabulary* (Hartford, 1895, p. 28), where statistics are given, compiled by J. Ritchie Smith (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October, 1891). Mr. Smith's figures, which seem to be exclusive of proper names, are in part as follows:

	Whole Number	Total Vocabulary	Peculiar Words
Luke . . .	35,239	2,697	715
Paul . . .	31,457	2,446	797
John . . .	27,185	1,396	212
Matthew . .	17,921	1,542	111
Mark . . .	10,720	1,259	77

These figures of Mr. Smith's seem to be the results of counts, not of estimates, and are of some weight for that reason. They are disappointing to the critical student, however, because they do not distinguish between Luke and Acts, between the Pastorals and the ten letters of the primary Pauline canon, or even between the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel.

With the generous aid of my friend, Rev. A. R. Stark, Ph.D., I have undertaken a modest experiment in the study of Lucan vocabulary, our premise being that if Acts and the Third Gospel are from the same hand they should exhibit a considerable common base of vocabulary. Our statistics are made up from a careful page-by-page examination of Geden's *Concordance,* which we have treated as a somewhat objective standard. We have, however, added καί and δέ, disregarded different forms of the same word, and different uses of it (e.g., εἰ μή, οὐ μή), and we have included proper names. While our figures represent repeated recounts, we present them not as final, since there is room for wide difference of view as to what constitutes a word, but as on the whole presenting a fair proportionate view of the vocabulary phenomena of Acts and Luke's Gospel.

The Gospel of Luke contains 2,080 different words; Acts, 2,054. Luke and Acts use in common 1,014. A further count, strictly unnecessary, but undertaken as a partial check upon the first, shows the total vocabulary of Luke and Acts together (including every word used in either or both) to be 3,120 (Mr. Smith's figure, 2,697, is exclusive of proper names). Nearly half the words in

Luke are thus shared with Acts, and nearly half those in Acts are common to Luke.

It is natural to inquire whether this is a large proportion of common vocabulary, or whether any other document might not relate itself to Acts much as Luke has done in this particular. To satisfy ourselves on this point we have chosen the Gospel of Matthew, a document of very little less extent than Luke (68 pp. in Westcott-Hort, as against 72), dealing with the same general matters, and based largely upon the same sources with Luke. We find that Matthew has a vocabulary of 1,711 words, of which 845 are common to Acts.

	Different Words
Luke exhibits	2,080
Acts exhibits	2,054
Luke and Acts share	1,014
Luke or Acts or both exhibit	3,120
Matthew exhibits	1,711
Matthew and Acts share	845

The first impression of these figures is perhaps disappointing. Irrespective of any theory of the relation of Luke and Acts, based on other considerations, a more decided showing in one direction or another might have been hoped for. But it appears that Matthew, like Luke, shares slightly less than half its vocabulary with Acts. In this aspect the inquiry is not particularly suggestive. Upon closer inspection, however, it appears that Luke is much nearer Acts than is Matthew in the range of its vocabulary. It does not essentially reduce the force of this to recall that much of this excess of vocabulary is

proper names, for a large use of proper names is as individual a characteristic as a large use of common nouns. One man in telling a story will give no names, another will name everybody. It is worth noticing, further, that while the common vocabulary base of Matthew and Acts is 845, that of Luke and Acts is 1,014, or 20 per cent larger. From both points of view, therefore, these results tend to ally Luke with Acts in actual vocabulary exhibited.

These results have been quoted, with others, by Professor Cadbury in his work on the *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, p. 1. Professor Cadbury holds that more value attaches to the experiment if the proper names are omitted, and one must agree that to be complete the experiment should cover the vocabulary of the two books both with and without the proper names. Professor Cadbury gives a total vocabulary for Luke, exclusive of proper names, of 1,800 words; and for Acts, of 1,787. He accepts J. Ritchie Smith's total figure for their combined vocabulary, 2,697.

My own count is somewhat in excess of this. I find 1,914 different words, aside from proper names, in Luke; and 1,816 in Acts. Nine hundred and fifty-four are common to the two, making their total vocabulary, 2,776. That is, almost exactly half of Luke's general vocabulary is shared with Acts, and decidedly more than half of the general vocabulary of Acts is shared with Luke.

Of course no large claims are to be made for the argument from mere range and identity of vocabulary, un-

supported by other facts. These figures are offered simply as a contribution to the materials of Lucan criticism, and with the hope that, if they are not sufficient to justify any very striking generalization, they may at least prevent unguarded ones on the matter of Lucan vocabulary.

IX

I CLEMENT CALLED FORTH BY HEBREWS

IT IS a familiar fact that Hebrews is first reflected in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, usually called I Clement. A comparison of Hebrews, chapter 1, with I Clement, chapter 36, is enough to establish the use of Hebrews by Clement, but this is only the beginning of the evidence, for Bacon reports that in forty-seven places Clement made use of Hebrews. I Clement was written at Rome, and it is of no small significance for the criticism of Hebrews that it is first reflected in a document of Roman origin. It is this, among other things, that for most critics compels the conclusion that Hebrews was written to a Roman congregation, if not to the whole Roman church. Whichever of these views be accepted, it was by a writer, and probably from a congregation, familiar with Hebrews that I Clement was written.

It is more and more generally held, too, that Hebrews was written toward the close of the first century, probably at the very time when the insistence of Domitian upon emperor-worship was threatening Roman Christians, that is, between A.D. 90 and 96. It is, indeed, precisely the fact of its use in I Clement that supplies a latest possible date for Hebrews: it cannot have

been written later than the close of Domitian's reign (A.D. 96), because it is a well attested fact that I Clement was written in Domitian's last years. Both reflect a time of persecution and peril. The two documents are thus closely connected in time as well as place.

The writer to the Hebrews finds one chief fault with his Roman readers. They ought, by reason of age and opportunity, to be teachers and leaders, but as a matter of fact they are so backward and infantile that they are hardly ready themselves for advanced instruction. He finds much that is good in them: heroism, hospitality, liberal helpfulness, noble traits of the earliest Roman church, of which Acts and Tacitus give evidence. But they have been slow to undertake that service of Christian instruction and direction which their position and advantages demanded of them. "When ye ought by reason of the time to be teachers, ye have need of instruction." Whether the leadership he calls for is of the Roman church alone, or of the larger Christian body, does not greatly concern us here.

No long time after the receipt of this stern rebuke and challenge, the Roman church, through its chief presbyter, Clement, writes to Corinth. The Corinthians are not showing the office of presbyter the respect Rome, with its genius for order and regulation, thinks it deserves. Probably Corinth was more primitive in this attitude; but better organization was in the air; and the place of the presbyter was taking on great importance. The Roman church urges obedience to such officers upon the church at Corinth. The experiences of Old Testa-

ment heroes and of Christian apostles and the analogy of the ordered course of nature are cited in proof of the universal law of harmony. There is nothing to suggest that the Roman church has been appealed to by the Corinthians; the epistle seems rather to be an unsolicited contribution. The Roman church feels a certain responsibility for the sister church at Corinth, and, in a fraternal spirit, transmits a weighty message of advice and instruction for its use. Ignatius a few years after could say to the Romans, "Ye have taught others" (ἄλλους ἐδιδάξατε, Rom. 3:1).

In short, the Roman church is here doing the thing that the writer to the Hebrews had so recently been urging it, or a part of it, to do. They are no longer merely entertaining the strangers, ministering to the saints, enduring with heroism the spoiling of their goods, and showing compassion to them that are in bonds; they have added that very grace of teaching and leading, for the lack of which they had just been so sternly rebuked. Are we to refer this to mere chance coincidence? It is difficult to avoid the conviction that this sudden emergence of the Roman church as counselor and adviser to distant churches is the result of the stern rebuke of Hebrews. Even if what had been asked of the Roman church was only leadership, that task once undertaken would have led to the wider one; but it is in every way more probable that it was the wider function that was from the first intended.

Such a view at once relieves the difficulty of the opening sentence, which is so strangely apologetic: "Ow-

ing to the sudden and repeated calamities and reverses which have befallen us, brethren, we consider that we have been somewhat slow (*βράδιον*) to pay attention to the questions of dispute among you." This apology is not called for by any expectation on the part of the Corinthians that the Roman church would write; their surprise must have been, not that it had not written sooner, but that it wrote at all. But if the Romans are just awaking, under the stimulus of Hebrews, to a new responsibility, and beginning to think what Christian duty of teaching they have, and the Corinthian situation of which they have known for some time comes to their minds, it is not difficult to understand this opening sentence. As they now see, the mere fact of such a situation at Corinth was in itself a call to them to help with instruction and advice.

That I Clement is so permeated with the literary influence of Hebrews becomes on this view of their relation more than ever natural and necessary. Something more than mere recentness is necessary to explain the great mass of reminiscence of Hebrews in I Clement, especially in Rome, where for nearly three centuries thereafter Hebrews is little noticed. But if Hebrews has just been received, and I Clement is written under the spur of its challenge, this frequent reflection of its language and method is only natural.

I Clement is no inconsiderable work. Did it require an elaborate treatise as long as the Gospel of Mark to inform the Corinthians that it was their duty to live in harmony? Or is it that the Roman church assumes its

new function in great seriousness and makes a genuine effort of this first essay as teacher of churches? I suggest that alike the source, the date, the tone, the purpose, and the bulk of I Clement accord remarkably with the view that it was the response of the Roman church to the stirring call of Hebrews to Christian teachership and leadership.

Reading I Clement in the light of this observation, one finds the whole interpretation of it illuminated. Dr. Donald W. Riddle has applied it very skilfully in the study of Hebrews and I Clement as documents of Domitian's persecution (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIII [1924], 329–48). And from the halting first sentence of I Clement, Hebrews gives us the key to its meaning. It begins by apologizing for a fault that only Hebrews had pointed out, and continues with an encomium much like that which Hebrews had previously addressed to it. It is saturated with the Septuagint Scriptures, as Hebrews is. What were sentences in Hebrews are developed into long paragraphs in Clement; the verse about "your former leaders, who spoke to you the word of God" (13:7), has grown into the fifth chapter of I Clement, on the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, the "issue of their life," which the Romans were solemnly to consider and to be prepared to imitate. I Clement, chapter 17, similarly takes its cue from Heb. 11:37, and undertakes to name those who wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins. Moses, as a "faithful servant in all God's house," becomes the text for chapter 43 of I Clement. The influence of Hebrews is, in fact, written large all over I Clement.

The extraordinary resemblances between I Clement and I Peter seem to me to mark I Peter also as a result of the message of Hebrews. In it, as in I Clement, the church at Rome is doing its newly discovered duty of teaching the churches, this time of a whole group of provinces. The letter is clearly written on behalf of the church, as "your sister church in Babylon" (5:13) shows, and the salutation is curiously like that of I Clement. So also is the conception of the Christians as only sojourners in this world, which so much resembles Hebrews 11:13.

It would surely be artificial to require that the influence of early New Testament writings be sought only within the New Testament itself. Early Christian literature, canonical and uncanonical, was part of one great movement, and its documents may fairly be expected, sometimes at least, to show close connection. Hebrews was one of the most notable of these, and it would be strange if it had produced no traceable effect upon a church of which we know so much, relatively at least, in its day. May we not believe that in I Clement and I Peter we have the literary first fruits of the stirring call of Hebrews to the Roman Christians?

X

THE ORIGINAL CONCLUSION OF MARK

IN A brief but suggestive paper in the *Expositor* Canon Ayles has called attention to the problem presented by the fragmentary ending of the Gospel of Mark, and pointed out that much at least of what is wanting there can be recovered from the closing paragraphs of Matthew. This seems to me to admit of no doubt; in fact I should be disposed to go somewhat farther in this direction than Canon Ayles has done. His effort to recover a part of the missing original ending of Mark from the present Long Conclusion, however, strikes me as decidedly less convincing.

It is certainly a fair presumption that if the Gospel of Mark was ever complete it was so when the writer of the Gospel of Matthew used it. Indeed it is very likely that it was precisely because he had used it so extensively in writing his gospel that it so nearly disappeared from use. When we remember that all of Mark except perhaps forty verses is taken over, or at least clearly reflected in Matthew, we begin to wonder that Mark survived at all and did not shortly disappear as did the other sources of Matthew. This helps us to understand the loss of the original ending of Mark as due to mere dilapidation, just as most papyrus rolls that have come down to us have lost by accidental mutilation one end or both

ends. After the appearance of the Gospel of Matthew, which might be conceived as an improved edition of Mark, smoother, richer, more intelligible, and more edifying, it is difficult to see how Mark survived at all, except in places where Matthew might be unknown. At all events we may reasonably assume that Mark still possessed its original ending when it was used by the writer of Matthew.

We may also fairly expect to find this original ending of Mark, as Canon Ayles suggests, in combination, of course, with other materials, at the close of Matthew. Indeed we may fairly expect to find practically all of it there. Matthew has been omitting relatively little of Mark; in actual verses only one-sixteenth of Mark as we know it. If he continued to use Mark in this way, what he may have omitted of Mark's original ending would have been trifling in amount, unless of course it contained something inconsistent with Matthew's main interests. Certainly at the point where Mark breaks off, Matthew is copying his narrative quite faithfully. And as Canon Ayles and Dr. Plummer point out, Matthew's very next words actually fit better upon the last verse of Mark (16:8) than they do upon Matthew's form of that verse (28:8). This is proof positive that Matthew had a fuller Mark than ours, and that he is still following Mark after Mark disappears from our sight.

Canon Ayles is surely right in looking for the original conclusion of Mark in Matt. 28:9, 10, and 16–20, but not of course in 11–15, for that is the sequel of a non-Markan incident, the Bribing of the Watch. Mat-

thew doubtless got the sequel of that story where he got the story itself. In these verses (9, 10, 16–20), therefore, in view of the very full way in which Matthew has been using Mark, especially in this latter part of his gospel, I should expect to find practically all of the original conclusion of Mark.

But we are not wholly dependent upon the mirror of Mark which Matthew supplies, for Mark has himself given us a strong hint of how his Gospel is to end. It is to end with, or at least it is not to end without, a Galilean reappearance of Jesus. Canon Ayles quotes Mark 16: 7 to this effect, and we may add 14: 28, as even more convincing: "Howbeit after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee."

Now this Galilean reappearance of Jesus is the distinguishing feature of Matthew among the Synoptists. Can there be any doubt that he derived it from Mark? Not only verses 9 and 10*a*, then, but 10*b*, 16, 17*a*, and 18*a*, are proved to have stood in Mark's original conclusion. On the other hand Matt. 28: 18*b* is too reminiscent of Matt. 11: 27*a* to be safely credited to Mark. But Matt. 28: 19*a*, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations," is in substance probably from Mark, who says in 13: 10, "And the gospel must first be preached to all the nations." The word "make disciples" is a Matthaean but not a Markan word, and it is likely that Mark said, "Go and preach the gospel to all the nations." The baptismal formula of Matt. 28: 19*b* is not likely to have stood in Mark; there is even some question of its claim to its present position in Matthew.

Perhaps Eusebius' omission of it is really a lingering reminiscence of the old ending of Mark. The emphasis upon the apostles as teachers and upon Jesus' commandments, 28: 20*a*, is more natural in Matthew than it would be in Mark. Whether the last great clause in Matthew, "Behold I am with you all the days, unto the Consummation of the Age," stood originally in Mark is a more difficult question. The Consummation of the Age is of course a phrase peculiar to Matthew. It can hardly have stood in Mark. Mark is more likely to have read simply "the end" (τέλος), as he does in 13: 7 and 13. The deeper question is whether Mark could have described the risen Jesus as a continuing spiritual presence with his disciples, as Matthew does. But Mark has already recorded (13: 11) Jesus' promise of the Holy Spirit's presence and guidance in the trying days before the end, and Christians early came to believe that the Holy Spirit was his Spirit. If this is true, then we may reasonably reconstruct the Lost Ending of Mark on the basis of what Matthew preserves and what Mark itself foreshadows, as follows:[1]

And Jesus met them, saying, Hail! And they came and took hold of his feet and worshipped him. And Jesus saith unto them, Be not afraid, go, tell my brethren to depart into Galilee and there they shall see me. And they departed with great joy and ran to tell his disciples.

And the eleven disciples went into Galilee to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him they

[1] This reconstruction, while it resembles one I suggested in the *American Journal of Theology,* IX (1905), 484 ff., is in some details more faithful to the usage of Mark.

worshipped him. And Jesus came to them and spoke to them, saying, Go and preach the gospel to all the nations. Behold, I am with you all the days unto the end.

That any further elements of the original conclusion of Mark are to be sought in the Long Conclusion seems to me improbable. That conclusion was, as I believe, first composed to fill the gap occasioned by the loss, through accidental mutilation, of the original conclusion. The original conclusion would not in that case have been available as a source for the writer of the Long Conclusion. Nor does the Long Conclusion seem to me to supply elements which could have functioned appropriately in the original ending. The only exception is the expression "Preach the gospel" for Matthew's "Make disciples," where the Long Conclusion has fallen into a Markan form of expression. Much in the Long Conclusion that Canon Ayles finds congenial to Mark, and so accepts into the original conclusion, seems to me to have come from Acts and to have a decidedly late sound. Nor does it seem to me likely that Mark should have included any account of the carrying out of Jesus' commission to the disciples. Matthew is a more careful artist than Mark in these matters, and even he feels no such need of following the commission with an account of its accomplishment. And surely this way of finishing his narrative is much more effective than is that of the Long Conclusion.

In support of some details of the proposed restoration: Jesus' greeting to the women, "Hail!" (Χαίρετε, "Rejoice") dispels their gloom, reflected in verse 8, and

his next words, "Be not afraid," link themselves directly with Mark's words "For they were afraid" in verse 8. His next words repeat the command of the young man at the tomb (vs. 7), though Peter is not specified, and for "the disciples" we now have "my brethren," in harmony with Mark 3:34, 35. The references to a Galilean appearance are precisely in line with Mark 14:28, and 16:7. The appointed mountain can hardly be anything but the Mount of Transfiguration which Mark, followed by Matthew, has already vaguely connected by anticipation with the resurrection (Mark 9:9). The reader of the original Mark has been prepared for the "preaching of the gospel to all the nations" by Jesus' words in Mark 13:10, and though Matthew has integrated the words more deeply in the structure of his Gospel, they are entirely appropriate in a document of the Greek mission, like Mark. Jesus' promise of his presence is foreshadowed in Mark 13:11; "all the days" are evidently "the days," "those days" of the tribulation often mentioned in Mark, chapter 13 (vss. 17, 19, 20, 24), and doubtless understood by the evangelist as the very days in which he and his readers lived. "Through all the days" of their extremity Jesus' spirit will not fail them, 13:11 (cf. 13:23), "unto the end" mentioned in 13:7, 13, when his fuller messianic disclosure is to take place (cf. 13:24–26). Perhaps it is not altogether unnatural that a document that begins so curiously, Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ("Beginning of the gospel-preaching"), should have ended by projecting its vision of that same gospel-preaching on εἰς τέλος ("to the end").

The closing lines of Mark in Greek probably ran as follows:

Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑπήντησεν αὐταῖς λέγων Χαίρετε· αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κἀκεῖ με ὄψονται. Καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Οἱ δὲ ἕνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν. Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πορευθέντες κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας εἰς τέλος.

But however we may differ in details it seems to me no longer open to doubt that (1) the original ending of Mark described a Galilean reappearance of Jesus; and (2) that account with some amplification of the commission is preserved in the conclusion of Matthew.

INDEX

INDEX

Acts, 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 27, 29, 34, 39, 50, 65, 67, 69, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 104, 106, 107, 108, 111
Adams, 105
Ahikar, 79
Alexandrians, 62
Angels, 82
Annas, 82
Antioch, 36
Apollonius, 6, 23
Apostles, 26, 82
Apostolic Fathers, 9
Arabian Nights, 79
Aramaic, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78, 81, 82, 90
Asia, 32, 37, 38
Asia Minor, 32, 33
Ayles, 116, 117, 118, 120

Babel, 103
Babylon, 32, 35, 115
Bacon, 67, 86, 110
Barnabas, 41, 46
Baruch, 22
Basil, 17
Bethany, 84
Bunyan, 80
Burkitt, 68, 79

Cadbury, 67, 108
Caesarea, 99
Catholic epistles, 98
Cicero, 6, 23
Clement I, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 31, 34, 35, 41, 50, 73, 76, 87, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115
Clement of Alexandria, 46, 62
Clermont List, 53
Colossians, 16, 39, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58
Confusion of Tongues, 63, 103
Corinth, 111, 112
Corinthians, I and II, 3, 8, 9, 16, 32, 38, 39, 50, 53, 56, 57, 61, 73
Corinthians, III, 63

Domitian, 31, 87, 88, 90, 110, 111

Elijah, 101
Elisha, 101
Enoch, 41
Ephesians, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47, 50, 53, 56, 57, 61, 63
Ephesus, 11, 33, 45, 46, 57, 58, 60, 87, 97
Epictetus, 78
Epicurus, 6, 23
Epistle of the Apostles, 42
Eusebius, 119

Foakes Jackson, 67, 88

Galatians, 3, 9, 38, 50, 53, 57
Galilee, 118
Gospel of Peter, 33
Gospel, Fourfold, 63, 76
Graux, 104, 105
Greek, 70, 71, 73, 76, 78, 92
Greek Mission, 75, 84, 90, 92, 93, 95, 102

Harnack, 52, 56, 58, 59, 62, 84, 94
Hebraisms, 77
Hebrew, 69, 70, 74
Hebrews, 4, 7, 10, 30, 31, 34, 35, 62, 87, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115
Hecataeus, 92
Hermas, 41
Herod, 82
Herodotus, 91, 92
Holy Spirit, 82, 83, 85, 101, 103, 119
Hymnology, 14, 26, 57, 102

Ignatius, 8, 9, 10, 18, 31, 36, 37, 38, 44, 50, 59, 61, 76, 112
Irenaeus, 62

James, 40, 41, 69, 101
Jerusalem, 72, 83, 84, 86, 99, 103
Jesus, 73, 82, 83, 84, 99, 119
John, 16, 18, 74, 76, 106
John, letters of, 36, 44, 45, 55, 59, 60, 61
Jonah, 79
Josephus, 71
Jude, 40, 41, 42, 45

Knoch, 104, 105
Koine, 78

Laodicea, 58, 60
Laodiceans, 18, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63
Letter collections, 6, 43, 44, 45, 46
Letters, later Christian, 47
Logographers, 91
Luke, 14, 27, 28, 57, 67, 68, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 89, 90, 95, 97, 99, 104, 106, 107, 108

Marcion, 18, 42, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63
Mark, 33, 73, 74, 82, 83, 85, 89, 90, 94, 105, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122
Martyrdom of Polycarp, 43
Matthew, 73, 74, 82, 83, 85, 89, 90, 105, 107, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122
Moffatt, 69
Mormon, 80
Moulton, 79, 80
Muratorian, 22, 53, 56, 57, 62

Nero, 88
Nestle, 104

Oral gospel, 73
Origen, 17, 45, 46, 62

Papyri, 78
Pastorals, 45, 58, 59, 62, 86, 98, 106
Pater, Walter, 26
Paul, 4, 5, 9, 12, 32, 71, 87, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99
Paul, letters of, 1, 2, 13, 14, 15, 20, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 46, 47, 50, 55, 59, 60, 71, 73, 76, 106
Pentecost, 83, 103
Peter I, 4, 7, 10, 31, 32, 33, 35, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 87, 115
Peter, II, 40, 41
Philemon, 39, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63
Philippians, 9, 38, 50, 53, 57, 58, 62
Philo, 71
Pilate, 82
Plato, 6, 23, 45, 62
Pliny, 6, 23, 87
Plummer, 117
Plutarch, 6
Polycarp, 9, 10, 18, 38, 45, 50, 58, 59, 61, 73, 76
Preaching of Peter, 33
Presbyters, 111

Prophets, 27
Psalms, 83

Revelation of John, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 43, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 76, 87
Revelation of Peter, 33
Riddle, 114
Romans, 9, 32, 34, 38, 50, 53, 57, 65, 66
Rome, 26, 45, 65, 68, 81, 95, 96, 112, 113, 114

Salutations, 24, 69
Samaritans, 83
Schaff, 105
Scott, 85
Septuagint, 78, 79, 80, 114
Smith, 105, 106, 108
Smyrna, 36, 38, 42
Socrates, 95
Speaking with Tongues, 85, 103
Stark, 106
Story-telling, 79

Tacitus, 111
Thessalonians, I and II, 9, 18, 38, 50, 53, 57, 73
Timothy, 38, 39, 45
Tiro, 6
Titus, 38, 39, 45
Tobit, 79
Torrey, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 77, 79, 81, 84
Troas, 36, 96, 98

Unity, 12, 14, 15, 102

Vocabulary, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108

We-narratives, 88, 89, 92
Wilson, 67

Xenophon, 89, 94

Zahn, 104

[[PRINTED IN U·S·A·]]

Date Due

MAR 15 '61			
JAN 29 1963			
FAC			
FEB 26 1964			
MAY 13 1966			
NOV 29 1975			

225.12
G655n

Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson
AUTHOR

New solutions of New Testament
TITLE problems.

N10943

225.12
G655n Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson
New solutions of New
Testament problems.

N10943